Faculty of Arts
University of Helsinki

A Natural Export:
International Connections, Conservation Co-Operation, and How the National Park Idea Became "America's Best Idea"

Paula Johanna Saari

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION

To be presented for public discussion with the permission of the Faculty of Arts of the University of Helsinki, in lecture hall P673, Porthania, on the 26th of August 2020 at 14 o'clock.

Helsinki 2020

ISBN 978-951-51-6252-6 (paperback)
ISBN 978-951-51-6253-3 (PDF)

Unigrafia 2020
Helsinki

ABSTRACT

This study in the field of general history examines how the national park idea was constructed as an American invention through the international connections of national park officials. This dissertation argues that the national park idea—often popularly referred to as "America's Best Idea"—was effectively constructed as an American idea through the U.S. National Park Service's international work and park co-operation programs during the Cold War years. By the 1970s and 1980s, the national park idea was viewed as an American invention even in Finland, where nature conservation philosophy had traditionally derived from Swedish and German traditions.

The first national park in the world, Yellowstone National Park, was established in the United States in 1872. The United States has been viewed as an inspiration in national park matters from early on, but the national park idea as an American idea—a skillfully created and utilized story—was fully embraced only later as Yellowstone was powerfully promoted as the mythical origin of all national parks globally during the Cold War.

The study is mainly based on extensive archival research in the United States, Canada, and Finland, but it also utilizes several printed primary sources. The main focus of the study is on the international work of the U.S. National Park Service. The four chapters of the thesis examine the early promotion of national parks in the United States and the beginning of the U.S. National Park Service's international work, international national park co-operation and the uses of the national park idea during the Cold War, the mythical narrative of Yellowstone and the U.S. as the origin of the national park idea, and a case study of how the national park idea in Finland became "Americanized."

The theoretical and methodological framework of the study is within the field of environmental history. The dissertation is connected to the ongoing scholarly discussion of national parks in global perspective, which is a vibrant research interest among environmental historians. The study views national parks not only as nature conservation areas, but also as cultural constructions that reflect a society's relationship to nature, while also examining the use of national parks as forms of Cold War cultural diplomacy and export.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am grateful to my advisors, Professor Mikko Saikku and Professor Markku Peltonen, for their continuous support throughout this project. Mikko has believed in my abilities and encouraged my research efforts from an early stage in my studies—I would not have begun pursuing a doctoral degree without his steadfast support. Over the course of my doctoral studies, Markku has offered valuable guidance, in addition to patiently reading and admirably commenting on large amounts of text far from his own field of expertise. Professor Emeritus Markku Henriksson has been influential in igniting my interest in North America. I wish to thank Professor Richard Schein for his encouragement in the very early stages of the dissertation process. I am grateful to Professor Paul Sutter for the opportunity to spend the academic year 2014–2015 at the Department of History at the University of Colorado at Boulder as a visiting Fulbright scholar. At CU-Boulder, Professor Thomas Andrews also took the time to discuss my research with me, which was greatly appreciated. Over the years, numerous other scholars in the fields of environmental history, American studies, and Canadian studies have offered encouragement and helpful ideas. The members of the research seminar in general history and the North American Studies program have provided good discussions and valuable peer support. A collective thank you to all! I would like to thank the pre-examiners of this study, Professor Mark Fiege and Professor Karen R. Jones, for their favorable feedback and valuable suggestions on developing the work further. Thanks also to Dr. Rani-Henrik Andersson and Dr. Kari Saastamoinen for acting as the faculty representatives in the dissertation process.

I am grateful to the institutions that have funded this study. The University of Helsinki has supported my research with a four-year salaried position, additional grants for research travel, and a grant for completing the study. Funding for my research was also provided by the American-Scandinavian Foundation, the Eino Jutikkala Fund, the Emil Aaltonen Foundation, the Finnish Cultural Foundation, the Fulbright Center, and the Rockefeller Archive Center.

I also wish to thank friends and family members for their support. Special thanks to Lauri and Ihku the cat—they have admirably tolerated the long process of completing this work.

CONTENTS

Introduction

In a 1978 book about the ideals and practical management of national parks in Finland, park officials Pekka Borg and Hannu Ormio began their account by mentioning some of the early areas designated for nature protection, such as the old Indian and Chinese preserves for gods and animals that corresponded to today's nature preserves. These were not, however, the beginnings of national parks in their opinion. "Actually the national park idea was born in North America," the book duly noted, crediting the United States with the creation of the first national parks. What followed was a lengthy description of the history of U.S. national parks, mentioning several of the standard elements of the American conservation narrative, like the early park proposals, the protection of Yosemite, the mythical campfire discussion of the Washburn Expedition in 1870, the work of John Muir, and the creation of the U.S. National Park Service in 1916.[1] According to the popular narrative, the national park idea was born at Madison Junction, where the Washburn-Doane Expedition camped in September 1870 and where the members of the expedition—most notably Cornelius Hedges—suggested that the Yellowstone area be set aside and preserved as a public park.

After this detailed introduction on American national parks and international national park work, the book moved on to the actual subject matter—national parks and their management in Finland—as if to draw a straight line from Yellowstone to Finland's park history, contributing to the "America's best idea" narrative about national parks. But why did these two Finnish park officials write about American national parks and suggest that Yellowstone had been the first national park in the world, after which national parks had spread around the globe, when in fact the creation of national parks in Finland—which officially began in the late 1930s with the country's first national parks—had not actually been influenced by American national parks, as Finns had considered different models of nature protection more suitable?

What makes Borg and Ormio's account of the beginnings of the national park idea—and, in particular, their choice of attaching it to the United States—more perplexing is the fact that Finnish park history really did not necessarily need the

[1] Pekka Borg and Hannu Ormio, *Perustiedot kansallispuistoista: ihanteet ja käytäntö* (Porvoo: WSOY, 1978), 6–41. Quote from p. 6. "Varsinaisesti kansallispuistoaate syntyi Pohjois-Amerikassa …"

attachment of the national park idea to the mythical Madison Junction campfire. Finnish park authorities already had a perfectly fine national creation story of their own, one dating back to 1880 when the Finnish-Swedish arctic explorer and geologist Adolf Erik Nordenskiöld published a proposal for establishing national parks in the Nordic countries. The aim of this study is to explain why Borg and Ormio's choice of words does not seem so strange after all.

This dissertation argues that the national park idea was effectively constructed as America's best idea through the U.S. National Park Service's international work and park co-operation programs during the Cold War years. By the 1970s and 1980s, the national park idea was considered an American invention even in Finland, where nature conservation philosophy had traditionally derived from Swedish and German traditions. Finland's national parks had been created with heavy scientific and educational emphasis—a far cry from the American national parks replete with scenic motor roads, golf courses, and various other types of facilities for tourists. This study, however, does not focus on Finland as such, but concentrates instead on the making of the national park idea as a positive American idea. Finland's national park history is utilized as a case study to further examine a much bigger phenomenon—how the national park idea became viewed as an American idea globally.

Aims, Arguments, and Context

The national park idea is commonly viewed as "America's best idea,"[2] an idea with an American origin that has since spread around the globe. While this is a problematic view in many ways (which will be discussed later), it has stuck in public opinion. Even the U.S. National Park Service articulates that the national park idea is an American idea, for example in its 2006 management policies: "The idea of a national park was an

[2] The phrase is usually traced back to Wallace Stegner who noted that it is "the best idea we ever had" (and credited the phrase to Lord James Bryce) and popularized by Ken Burns in the documentary *The National Parks: America's Best Idea*. For a short discussion of the phrase, see Paul S. Sutter, "Geographies of Hope: Lessons from a World of National Parks," in *National Parks Beyond the Nation: Global Perspectives on "America's Best Idea,"* ed. Adrian Howkins, Jared Orsi, and Mark Fiege (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2016), 278–279.

American invention of historic consequences, marking the beginning of a worldwide movement that has subsequently spread to more than one hundred countries."[3]

This study examines how the national park idea was promoted and viewed as an American idea, and how Yellowstone achieved the mythical position as the first national park in the world. It looks at the process by which the national park became a distinctly American idea both in the U.S. and worldwide—in the minds of Americans, who realized the value of a positive brand like the national park in international circles, as well as foreigners, who became influenced by American national park ideals and (for various reasons) came to cherish the national park as an American idea. The study centers on how the national park idea was constructed as an American invention—but it also sheds light on the international connections of national parks and the meaning of this international dimension to the national park idea more generally.

In this study, I make several arguments. Most importantly, I argue that the national park idea was constructed as an American idea globally—even if it had not necessarily been the model previously for all foreign national parks. This took place especially during the Cold War, when the national park idea was particularly useful, being a universally positive idea and enabling peaceful co-operation. I suggest that the worldwide origin of the national park idea at Yellowstone was a carefully created and skillfully utilized story. I suggest that the central issue is not whether the United States actually had an influence on foreign countries and provided the model for the creation of national parks around the globe soon after the establishment of Yellowstone National Park in 1872. What is significant is that the national park idea was constructed as an American invention much later—so powerfully so that it became known as "America's best idea." I also argue that the transnational dimension is central to studying the national park idea. I will also add further insights to the argument that the national park idea was pragmatic and flexible, reflecting the relationship between the nation and nature, and always changing to fit the times.

This study is important because it examines the international work of the U.S. National Park Service, which has been neglected in previous studies, as scholars have been more interested in tracking the history of the American national park system and the distinct American relationship to nature. I argue, however, that it is essential to

[3] National Park Service Management Policies 2006, https://www.nps.gov/policy/MP_2006.pdf (Accessed 26 July 2019).

examine the international connections of the U.S. National Park Service and national park work in other countries, since taking such a perspective shows the special qualities of American national park history more clearly. Only through placing the American national park idea and the work of the U.S. National Park Service in an international context are we able to fully understand their history.

This study also adds further insight to the debate about national parks as an American idea by arguing that while Yellowstone was not necessarily the model for foreign parks in the beginning, it became known as the world's first national park only later through the U.S. National Park Service's international connections and programs. My study also shows how the Finnish park idea became Americanized, which importantly illustrates the wider argument of the study and connects the largely neglected history of Finnish national parks to the international dimension.

**

This study is connected to the ongoing scholarly discussion of national parks in a global perspective. There is currently considerable interest in exploring transnational and comparative histories of national parks. So far, the scholarly studies examining parks beyond the level of the nation-state have mostly been edited collections with separate articles on different countries and parks, arranged together to provide a global picture of the national park idea, with most of the attention focused on highlighting or questioning the direct U.S. influence on specific countries and parks at specific times in history. Current research on national parks from a transnational perspective agrees that the national park idea is an extremely fluid and flexible concept that has been adapted differently in different countries and that attention to international connections is absolutely central to understanding the park system of any country. Studies have also sought to highlight the global diversity of parks. The main interest of studies has been on explaining the implementation of the national park idea worldwide: the differences, similarities, influences, and conditions for creating national parks, and the degree to

which the idea was influenced by American developments and followed Yellowstone's example.[4]

Fascinating recent studies by, for example, Patrick Kupper and Emily Wakild have noted how differently from the U.S. model the national park idea has been realized in Switzerland and Mexico, which have had their own twists on the national park concept, while also noting the importance of the transnational exchange of ideas with the U.S. Their studies have demonstrated that the national park idea can be understood quite differently in other societies, highlighting the value of understanding the varied adaptations of the national park idea.[5] This further highlights the necessity of inquiring more broadly into the transnational history of the national park idea as a valuable addition to current scholarship. As Kupper notes, it is useful to examine "how transnational exchange processes influence national outcomes," since "[n]arrating national parks in a transnational perspective allows one not only to account for national differences and for the role of international connections in the past but also to place current issues of preservation, science, and recreation in a broader context."[6]

Despite national parks having been established in many countries, the United States has, however, notably made the strongest claim to the idea of national

[4] Bernhard Gissibl, Sabine Höhler, and Patrick Kupper (eds), *Civilizing Nature: National Parks in Global Historical Perspective* (New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2012) is an excellent collection of articles. The collection also points out the need for further work on the transnational history of national parks. Adrian Howkins, Jared Orsi, and Mark Fiege (eds), *National Parks Beyond the Nation: Global Perspectives on "America's Best Idea"* (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2016) is another great edited collection. On the history of national parks and other kinds of parks, see also Karen R. Jones and John Wills, *Invention of the Park: Recreational Landscapes from the Garden of Eden to Disney's Magic Kingdom* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005).

[5] Patrick Kupper, "Science and the National Parks: A Transatlantic Perspective on the Interwar Years," *Environmental History* 14, 1 (January 2009): 58–81; Emily Wakild, "Border Chasm: International Boundary Parks and Mexican Conservation 1935–1945," *Environmental History* 14, 3 (July 2009): 453–475. See also Kupper, *Wildnis schaffen: Eine transnationale Geschichte des Schweizerischen Nationalparks* (Bern: Haupt, 2012) and Wakild, *Revolutionary Parks: Conservation, Social Justice, and Mexico's National Parks, 1910–1940* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2011). In the Swiss National Park, strong emphasis has been on scientific research as the primary mandate for park protection. Mexican national parks, on the other hand, were created with close links to social reform connected to revolutionary politics. Both models are quite distinct from the U.S. national park idea, even though, as Kupper notes, there have been exchanges of ideas with Swiss park people. Wakild has noted how the different interpretations of the park idea (and of nature conservation in general) affected the plans for the establishment of a joint border park. For international perspective, see also South African national park history, for example, Jane Carruthers, *The Kruger National Park: A Social and Political History* (Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 1995); Jane Carruthers, *National Park Science. A Century of Research in South Africa* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017); Jane Carruthers, "The Royal Natal National Park, Kwazulu-Natal: Mountaineering, Tourism and Nature Conservation in South Africa's First National Park c.1896 to c.1947," *Environment and History* 19, 4 (November 2013): 459–485.

[6] Kupper, "Science and the National Parks," 60, 76.

parks, popularly referred to as "America's Best Idea," and Yellowstone National Park has been almost a mythical point of reference in other countries setting up their own park systems. Studies have focused on the influence (or lack thereof) that Yellowstone National Park has provided for other park systems. The national park idea is regularly noted to be an American invention that has disseminated globally,[7] and even studies that deal with the parks in other countries take the American national park idea as the self-evident starting point for discussion.[8] Ian Tyrrell, on the other hand, has argued that American national parks were a "transnational creation of national space," influenced by international connections, and "provided no model for the global diffusion of the idea."[9]

National parks have been a very significant topic in American environmental historiography.[10] Some older studies on U.S. national parks have stressed the narrative of a mythical and unique creation, and celebrated the worldwide diffusion of the American national park idea. For example, Roderick Nash has argued that the national park idea derives from unique American experiences and that the United States

[7] For example, Michael Lewis (ed.), *American Wilderness: A New History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007), 4, suggests that "The American national park system is perhaps our most globally accepted governmental idea."

[8] Katrina Z. S. Schwartz, in her account of the history of Latvian national parks in *Nature and National Identity after Communism: Globalizing the Ethnoscape* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2006), notes at the beginning of chapter 5, on page 115: "Like so many other American creations, the national park idea took root around the world, and along with it the American understanding of parks as empty wilderness. Perhaps the best-known examples of this dissemination are Africa's first national parks …"

[9] See Ian Tyrrell, "America's National Parks: The Transnational Creation of National Space in the Progressive Era," *Journal of American Studies* 46, 1 (February 2012): 1–21; and responses by Paul S. Sutter, "The Trouble with 'America's National Parks'; or, Going Back to the Wrong Historiography: A Response to Ian Tyrrell," *Journal of American Studies* 46, 1 (February 2012): 23–29; and Thomas R. Dunlap, "Beyond the Parks, beyond the Borders: Some of the Places to Take Tyrrell's Perspective," *Journal of American Studies* 46, 1 (February 2012): 31–36; and Astrid Swenson, "Response to Ian Tyrrell, 'America's National Parks: The Transnational Creation of National Space in the Progressive Era,'" *Journal of American Studies* 46, 1 (February 2012): 37–43.

[10] In this study, I do not examine the general history of conservation in more detail. For more on conservation, see, for example, Samuel P. Hayes, *Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency: The Progressive Conservation Movement, 1890–1920* (New Haven: Harvard University Press, 1959); Stephen Fox, *The American Conservation Movement: John Muir and His Legacy* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985); Louis S. Warren, *The Hunter's Game: Poachers and Conservationists in Twentieth Century America* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997); Kurkpatrick Dorsey, *The Dawn of Conservation Diplomacy: U.S.-Canadian Wildlife Protection Treaties in the Progressive Era* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998); Mark W. T. Harvey, *A Symbol of Wilderness: Echo Park and the American Conservation Movement* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2000); Donald Worster, *A Passion for Nature: The Life of John Muir* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008).

has then exported it to the rest of the world.[11] Scholars have also been interested in the purpose of national parks. Alfred Runte has argued, in his "worthless lands" thesis, that parks were only created in areas from which no other profit could be extracted.[12]

These national park studies were followed and challenged by a generation of national park historians who moved American national park scholarship in a more critical direction. They noted, for example, the connections of national parks with class and the removal of Native peoples, further complicating the previous glorified accounts of park beginnings.[13] One central and long-standing point of debate in the field has been the question of the purpose of national parks and the balance between their preservation and use.[14] The most recent national park studies, many being histories of individual parks, have skillfully demonstrated that the national park idea has been rather elastic and has evolved to fit the changing times and society's changing needs.[15]

In more recent years, there has been interest in critically examining the U.S. creation of the national park idea, with calls for further work on the transnational aspects of the American national park idea.[16] Recently, American national parks have been more connected to their international dimension in research, but this remains relatively rare.[17]

---

[11] Roderick Nash, "The American Invention of National Parks," *American Quarterly* 22, 3 (Autumn 1970): 726–735. See also Nash's classic, *Wilderness and the American Mind,* 4th ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001 [1967]).

[12] Alfred Runte, *National Parks: The American Experience,* 2nd, rev. ed. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1987 [1979]).

[13] Mark David Spence, *Dispossessing the Wilderness: Indian Removal and the Making of the National Parks* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Karl Jacoby, *Crimes Against Nature: Squatters, Poachers, Thieves, and the Hidden History of American Conservation* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2001).

[14] Richard West Sellars, *Preserving Nature in the National Parks: A History* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1997); James A. Pritchard, *Preserving Yellowstone's Natural Conditions: Science and the Perception of Nature* (Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska Press, 1999); Mark Daniel Barringer, *Selling Yellowstone: Capitalism and the Construction of Nature* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2002).

[15] James W. Feldman, *A Storied Wilderness: Rewilding the Apostle Islands* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2011); David Louter, *Windshield Wilderness: Cars, Roads and Nature in Washington's National Parks* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2006); Jerry J. Frank, *Making Rocky Mountain National Park: The Environmental History of an American Treasure* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2013).

[16] As already mentioned, Tyrrell, "America's National Parks" is a recent example that has spurred some discussion.

[17] For a short overview of NPS international activities, see Terence Young and Lary M. Dilsaver, "Collecting and Diffusing 'the World's Best Thought': International Cooperation by the National Park Service," *The George Wright Forum* 28, 3 (2011): 269–278. For an examination of the relationship between the Canadian National Parks Branch and the U.S. National Park Service, see Terence Young,

Canadian national parks have merited a long line of studies, which have mostly dealt with the same central questions regarding the creation and purpose of national parks, as well as problems arising from disputes over land use, as have American studies. American national park histories have often been used as comparative viewpoints in Canadian park studies, understandably so, as the national park systems and park histories of the two countries have been rather similar. Despite the quite extensive volume of studies on national parks, Canadian research has mostly focused only on Canadian national parks. Some studies have made brief international comparisons to national parks of other countries, typically to those in the United States.[18] This study also examines the Canadian parks agency's international connections and its participation in international park co-operation.

Furthermore, the study will connect Finnish national parks to this scholarly discussion.[19] This is important given that Finnish environmental

---

Alan MacEachern, and Lary Dilsaver, "Canada-US Cooperation: From Continental Competitors to Global Partners," forthcoming in *Environment and History*.

[18] Older studies on Canadian parks have stressed either the developmental or preservationist aims of parks. Similar to Runte's worthless lands thesis is Robert Craig Brown's argument that with the creation of national parks, the government at the time was merely following its general policy of development in bringing these areas into "usefulness." See Robert Craig Brown, "The Doctrine of Usefulness: Natural Resource and National Park Policy in Canada, 1887–1914," in *Canadian Parks in Perspective: Based on the Conference the Canadian National Parks Today and Tomorrow, Calgary, October 1968*, ed. J. G. Nelson (Montreal: Harvest House, 1975). See also Leslie Bella, *Parks for Profit* (Montreal: Harvest House, 1987), who suggests that while parks were "supposed to be about preservation," "most Canadian parks have not been removed from economic development, but have been the focus of that development." Janet Foster, *Working for Wildlife: The Beginning of Preservation in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998 [1978]) stresses the conservationist motivations of early park officials. For newer, more critical studies, see, for example, Alan MacEachern, *Natural Selections: National Parks in Atlantic Canada, 1935–1970* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001); Paul Kopas, *Taking the Air: Ideas and Change in Canada's National Parks* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2007); Claire Elizabeth Campbell (ed.), *A Century of Parks Canada 1911–2011* (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2011); John Sandlos, "Federal Spaces, Local Conflicts: National Parks and the Exclusionary Politics of the Conservation Movement in Ontario, 1900–1935," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 16, 1 (2005): 293–318. On the exclusion of Native peoples from parks, see Theodore Binnema and Melanie Niemi, "'Let the Line Be Drawn Now': Wilderness, Conservation, and the Exclusion of Aboriginal People from Banff National Park in Canada," *Environmental History* 11, 4 (2006): 724–750 and John Sandlos, "Not Wanted in the Boundary: the Expulsion of the Keeseekoowenin Ojibway Band from Riding Mountain National Park," *Canadian Historical Review* 89, 2 (2008): 189–221. For comparative Canadian-American research, see Karen R. Jones, *Wolf Mountains: A History of Wolves Along the Great Divide* (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2001). For a detailed commissioned history of Canadian national parks, see W.F. Lothian, *A Brief History of Canada's National Parks* (Ottawa: Environment Canada, 1987). On Canadian conservation history, see also Tina Loo, *States of Nature: Conserving Canada's Wildlife in the Twentieth Century* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2006).

[19] Even though I point this out, it is not the primary interest of this study. I am only interested in examining Finnish parks insofar as they can be used to examine the transnational history of the American

historiography has traditionally focused on very different questions than national parks or the cultural construction of nature. The focus of Finnish environmental history has been on climate, forests, and water use, and even though there is a long tradition of interest in environmental historical topics in Finland, environmental history has not been institutionalized, but has instead been practiced under various academic traditions.[20] While national parks and wilderness have been important topics in the North American tradition of environmental history, Finnish environmental historians have not paid much attention to Finland's national parks. The dissertation aims to fill this historiographical gap and to place Finnish national parks and ideas about nature into an international context by connecting North American approaches to the environmental historical tradition in Finland. This also fits with current interest in the U.S. and Canada for connecting their environmental histories to those of other countries.[21]

**

I suggest that a more balanced account of the international history of the American national park idea will be achieved via a broader study that critically examines the international work of the U.S. national park authorities. The dissertation offers a wider perspective on the international history of national parks by examining how the narrative of the national park idea as an American invention was created. This includes also looking at the promotion of the national park idea as a cultural export and examining how its intellectual influence then shaped the national park idea in foreign

---

park idea. Therefore the study does not provide a comprehensive history of Finland's parks, but rather examines them in an American context.

[20] Timo Myllyntaus, "Suomalaisen ympäristöhistorian kehityslinjoja," *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* 89, 4 (1991): 321–331. See also Timo Myllyntaus and Mikko Saikku, "Environmental History: A New Discipline with Long Traditions," in *Encountering the Past in Nature: Essays in Environmental History*, ed. Timo Myllyntaus and Mikko Saikku, 2nd, rev. ed. (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2001), 1–28; Finn Arne Jørgensen et al., "Entangled Environments: Historians and Nature in the Nordic Countries," *Historisk Tidsskrift* (Norway) 92, 1 (2013).

[21] Paul S. Sutter, "The World with Us: The State of American Environmental History," *Journal of American History* 100, 1 (2013): 94–119. The essay is accompanied by commentaries from other environmental historians. Christof Mauch in particular notes the importance of connecting American environmental history to that of other countries in his comment, "Which World Is with Us? A Tocquevillian View on American Environmental History," *Journal of American History* 100, 1 (2013): 124–127. There has been considerable interest also in Canada for exploring the connections between Canadian environmental history and other countries like the U.S. and Nordic countries. Recent events, such as the "Northern Nations, Northern Natures" workshop in Stockholm in 2013, have explored the connections between Canadian and Scandinavian northern environments.

countries—for example in Finland. This study makes a novel contribution in arguing that the Americanness of the national park idea—the popular notion that Yellowstone was the birth-place for national parks around the globe—was constructed only later, linking the National Park Service's international co-operation and the creation of the "America's Best Idea" narrative.

The study has a clear focus that is distinct from previous studies, which have mostly been interested in examining the direct influence of American national parks and whether the national park idea was an American export after the creation of Yellowstone National Park. Instead, I am interested in how the national park idea was constructed as a great American invention and suggest that perhaps the national park idea was not "America's best idea" at its inception, but rather was constructed as such during the Cold War.

I will show that the national park idea was not necessarily an American export in the beginning but became one only during the Cold War years. In a way, the study will be complementing both the common narrative of national parks as "America's best idea" as well as Ian Tyrrell's argument that "the United States provided no model for global diffusion of the idea,"[22] by suggesting that while this might have been the case in the beginning, since then—and especially during the Cold War years—the United States exported its park idea on a global scale, clearly influencing ideas about national parks. This study will provide a broader picture of the "America's best idea" narrative as it illustrates the construction of this narrative by looking at how the national park became "America's best idea" through the NPS's—as well as some other countries'—international activities.

I do not take the U.S. primacy as a given, but look instead at the construction and demonstrations of that centrality and use it as a theme through which to think about the international history of national parks. The study will look at the processes that constructed the national park idea as "American" and through which the park idea was articulated as "American"—therefore, my interest is in examining the construction and articulation of the national park idea in this international dimension. I am not necessarily concerned with Yellowstone's actual primacy or importance, but rather the process in which it has assumed this importance. National parks are popularly

[22] Tyrrell, "America's National Parks," 4.

understood as "America's Best Idea"—but how did the park idea become constructed and promoted as "American" in transnational exchanges and international connections? The national park idea and its promotion as "American" in an international dimension can also be considered as part of the American modernization and development agenda abroad.

The international dimension is central to understanding just what is designated as nationally meaningful nature and what landscapes are protected and valued as national parks. Promoting the park idea abroad was part of a much broader project encompassing many American federal offices, organizations, and individuals. This was a question of transforming ideas about nature and people's relationship to natural resources—which, in part, could be done with the export of the national park idea which carried the connotations of democracy and other positive values. Therefore, the study is more widely connected to ideas about nature.

As already mentioned, in this study I do not focus on whether the national park idea really is "America's Best Idea," but rather I am interested in how this narrative was created and promoted. I also do not argue that national parks necessarily were an American export or that all national parks were influenced by American parks—just that national parks could be treated as a cultural export and promoted as an American idea. Therefore, my discussion of the national park as America's best idea should not be understood as claiming that it is or was—I am merely referring to the existing narrative.

With that said, several matters remain beyond the scope of this study. This is not a complete account of the international work of the U.S. National Park Service, nor does it seek to be such. As this study looks into the history of the U.S. National Park Service's international work and the meanings and influence of the American park idea abroad, with primary attention on how the national park idea was promoted as an American invention, I examine many aspects of international co-operation and transnational connections relating to the park idea. However, this study is by no means a comprehensive account of everything related to national parks in the international dimension, as I am addressing the topic only from the viewpoint of creating and promoting the park idea as an American idea in international connections. For example, international conservation and park conferences are topics too broad to be addressed

thoroughly here. Therefore, it is impossible to look at the U.S. National Park Service's international work in its entirety within the confines of this study, nor am I able to focus more closely on international conservation meetings as such.

In this study, I am less interested in formal conservation programs or the Cold War as such, and more interested in the narrative that was created at the time. Cold War political developments or conservation programs as such are beyond the scope of this study—I will address them only as they relate to the larger story of creating the narrative, and even then, the topic is so vast that not everything can be discussed. The place of science in the export of the park idea, foundations funding international park programs, and the role of big international non-governmental organizations in international park matters are topics that—despite their importance—are not addressed in great detail in this study. The Cold War, natural resources, and conservation diplomacy, as well as nature and race, are important areas of research that are only briefly addressed in this study.

My discussion of the American national park system concerns only National Parks—not National Historic Sites, National Monuments, National Seashores, or any other units[23] protected and managed by the United States federal government, for obvious and compelling reasons. The other units are simply beyond the scope of this study. The other units in the U.S. system are also not significant for my research questions, as the other protected units do not have similar international importance as do national parks, with foreign countries opting for the label "national park" for their protected natural areas, even if in some cases another category might be better suited (which goes to show the allure of the term "national park").

On Nature, Culture, and National Parks: Environmental History as a Field

The theoretical framework of the study is situated within the field of environmental history, which studies the past interactions between humans and nature. In Donald Worster's well-known model, research themes for the field include chronicling natural environments of the past and examining societies and their economies in relation to the

[23] Those interested in national monuments should consult Hal Rothman, *America's National Monuments: The Politics of Preservation* (University Press of Kansas, 1989).

environments in which they operate. In addition to these themes, one cluster of issues in the environmental historical tradition deals with the human perception of nature.[24]

As the understanding of nature is culturally constructed, the central premise of my study lies in viewing national parks not only as means of nature protection as natural areas, but also as cultural constructions that reflect a country's relationship to nature. How a culture has viewed, valued, and treated nature is revealed in the history of its national parks system. Even though parks are often associated with the natural world, as the establishment of parks works to naturalize their existence, they are embedded with cultural meaning and reflect history. What we are protecting in national parks, by setting aside areas that create ideal wild nature as something separate from culture, is a reflection of a society's values and ideas about nature. By creating national parks, we are producing nature as much as we are protecting it. As Claire Campbell notes, "national parks are not 'islands of wilderness' saved from history: they are the work of human hands and records of our history. They document our relationship to nature, not just as we wish it could be, but as it has been."[25]

Nature is not as natural as it seems, since describing it contains so much of our values, and thinking about nature is so connected to our culture. "Nature" and "culture" are not really categories separate from each other; rather, they are intrinsically entangled. Within environmental history, considerable attention has been paid to this

[24] See Donald Worster's seminal essay, "Appendix: Doing Environmental History," in *The Ends of the Earth*, ed. Donald Worster (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988), 289–307. See also Timo Myllyntaus, "Environment in Explaining History: Restoring Humans as Part of Nature," in *Encountering the Past in Nature: Essays in Environmental History*, ed. Timo Myllyntaus and Mikko Saikku, 2nd, rev. ed. (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2001), 141–160; Richard White, "From Wilderness to Hybrid Landscapes: The Cultural Turn in Environmental History," *The Historian* 66 (Fall 2004): 557–564. Natural circumstances have an important role in historical events that might not *seem* to be about the environment. Many important historical events can be reframed as environmental history, see Mark Fiege, *The Republic of Nature: An Environmental History of the United States* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2012). For seminal studies in American environmental history, see, for example, William Cronon, *Changes in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1983); William Cronon, *Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West* (New York: Norton, 1991); Alfred W. Crosby, *Ecological Imperialism: The Biological Expansion of Europe, 900–1900* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986); Alfred W. Crosby, *The Columbian Exchange: Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492* (Westport: Greenwood Publishing Company, 1972); Richard White, *The Organic Machine: The Remaking of the Columbia River* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1995); Donald Worster, *Dust Bowl: The Southern Plains in the 1930s* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979); Donald Worster, *Rivers of Empire: Water, Aridity, and the Growth of the American West* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1985).

[25] Claire Campbell, "Governing a Kingdom: Parks Canada, 1911–2011," in *A Century of Parks Canada 1911–2011*, ed. Claire Elizabeth Campbell (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2011), 2.

dynamic, and especially to wilderness as a historical and cultural construct.[26] Research on the cultural construction of wilderness has spurred widespread debate about wilderness—not about real, existing wilderness areas but the *idea* of wilderness. American environmental historians have noted that wilderness is a changing ideal,[27] while others have questioned its suitability to foreign countries.[28] Activists, for example, have argued that talking about wilderness as a historical construct obscures attention to environmental problems.[29]

National parks are usually thought of as places where nations preserve their finest landscapes. They are national in the sense that they are often created on lands characteristic of national landscapes and for the benefit the citizens of that country, as well as to function as national assets to attract tourists from around the globe. The national park seems like an intrinsic national development, a national treasure, embedded in the nation-state. Actually though, the spaces promoted as national treasures and as icons of a particular homeland have been to a great degree created in international co-operation and through transnational influences. There is a significant international dimension to them. National parks are influenced by and created through transnational flows of ideas. Park designation, then, involves setting aside areas designated as wild nature, as created and inspired by transnational developments and influences.

Recently, scholars have shown considerable interest in examining American environmental history in a transnational perspective.[30] While the importance

---

[26] See William Cronon's classic essay on the problematic concept of wilderness, "The Trouble with Wilderness; or, Getting Back to the Wrong Nature," in *Uncommon Ground: Toward Reinventing Nature*, ed. William Cronon (New York: Norton, 1995), 69–90.

[27] See, for example, Lewis (ed.), *American Wilderness*; Paul S. Sutter, *Driven Wild: How the Fight against Automobiles Launched the Modern Wilderness Movement* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2002); James Morton Turner, *The Promise of Wilderness: American Environmental Politics since 1964* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2012).

[28] Ramachandra Guha, "Radical American Environmentalism and Wilderness Preservation: A Third World Critique," *Environmental Ethics* 11 (1989): 71–83.

[29] Dave Foreman, "Wilderness Areas for Real," in *The Great New Wilderness Debate*, ed. J. Baird Callicott and Michael P. Nelson (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1998): 395–407.

[30] See, for example, Paul Sutter, "What Can U.S. Environmental Historians Learn from Non-U.S. Environmental Historiography?" *Environmental History* 8, 1 (January 2003): 109–129. Some examples of studies demonstrating the importance of comparative and transnational inquiry when examining ideas about nature include William Beinart and Peter Coates, *Environment and History: The Taming of Nature in the USA and South Africa* (London: Routledge, 1995); Thomas R. Dunlap, *Nature and the English Diaspora: Environment and History in the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999); Ian Tyrrell, *True Gardens of the Gods: Californian-*

of a transnational perspective has been noted, it has not been a simple or easily defined term. Environmental historians have employed the concept "transnational" in a wide array of topics and have not generally been too clear about the terminology and differences between related concepts.[31] The difficulties in differentiating between transnational, international, comparative, and global, for example, have been frequently pointed out. Some useful definitions have been provided, however, of just what is meant by a transnational perspective in history. A transnational approach is one that is centrally concerned with the circulation of ideas and "focuses on uncovering connections across particular political units," going beyond merely comparative studies.[32] A particularly useful discussion of transnationalism defines it as an approach that deals with various things—ideas, people, and practices—that cross borders in different ways and that reconsiders the importance of the nation-state as an explanatory force (however, this focus on transnational flows and connections does not mean that the nation is insignificant).[33]

In researching the history of national parks, a transnational perspective can be briefly explained as an interest in contrasting national approaches to national parks and examining how international processes and transnational exchanges have influenced these national differences and similarities. Exploring the national park idea in a transnational perspective entails studying how it has spread to and been implemented in diverse places. Often these adaptations have been very different from, for example, U.S. national parks, as parks have been shaped by local conditions and "national park" has been a rather flexible term used for many different forms of nature conservation that have been practiced under the label of national park. National parks, however, owe their existence and development also to the transnational dissemination of ideas and practices. Still, the nation-state is an important scale of analysis, as national parks are established and transformed on this scale. Exploring national parks in a transnational perspective is, in some ways, a way of examining the influence of and signs of the

---

Australian Environmental Reform, 1860–1930 (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1999).

[31] Joseph E. Taylor, III, "Boundary Terminology," *Environmental History* 13, 3 (July 2008): 454–481.

[32] C.A. Bayly, Sven Beckert, Matthew Connelly, Isabel Hofmeyr, Wendy Kozol, and Patricia Seed, "AHR Conversation: On Transnational History," *The American Historical Review* 111, 5 (2006): 1441–1464, quote from p. 1454; Micol Seigel, "Beyond Compare: Comparative Method after the Transnational Turn," *Radical History Review* 91 (2005): 62–90.

[33] Heikki Mikkeli, "Crossing Borders: Transnational European History and Cosmopolitan Ideals," (unpublished manuscript), 5–6.

global in the local, making parks "globalized localities."[34] In this study, I use the words "international" and "transnational" interchangeably.

When referring to national parks in countries other than the U.S., my usage of the term "national park" should not be understood as starting from the assumption that all parks are like ones in the United States or that the American terminology has been taken as a given. Use of the term "national park" to refer to conservation areas in other countries that are equivalent to national parks is not done to unquestioningly adopt an American-centric perspective, but because foreign countries have often preferred the more appealing term "national park" over other suitable alternatives.[35] Sometimes, for brevity's sake, I refer to "parks." However, this word should be understood to refer to "national parks" throughout this study.

Notes on Sources

This study is mostly based on archival records collected at the (U.S.) National Archives and Records Administration in College Park, Maryland; The Rockefeller Archive Center in Sleepy Hollow, New York; Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa; the National Archives of Finland (Kansallisarkisto); and the Finnish Ministry of Environment (Ympäristöministeriö) in Helsinki. In addition, I utilize published materials, such as national park brochures, conservation magazines, and other national park documents.

Most of the archival research for this study was done at the National Archives and Records Administration in College Park, Maryland. I have mainly utilized Record Group 79, Records of the National Park Service, with some relevant files from Record Group 59, General Records of the Department of State, and Record Group 43, Records of International Conferences, Commissions, and Expositions.

The amount of archival materials on American national parks is immense. The files on foreign national parks and international co-operation have not been widely

[34] My discussion of this draws on Gissibl, Höhler, and Kupper (eds), *Civilizing Nature*. As recent work on the global history of national parks has employed a variety of concepts in its discussion of parks on a scale larger than the nation-state—such as transnational, global, international, and comparative—I have not considered it essential to draw clear differences here either. The important point here is a scale that goes beyond that of the nation-state, which is useful for examining national park histories.

[35] Gissibl, Höhler, and Kupper (eds), *Civilizing Nature*, 14, has a useful chart of nature protection areas that have been named national parks but fall under a different category in the IUCN classification.

utilized in previous research. It has required a great amount of work to piece together a history from a sizable number of documents, especially as the scope of my study ranges from the 1870s to the 1970s (or even the 1980s with the Finnish materials). Since the study focuses on the international connections and programs of the U.S. National Park Service—a large topic in itself—it was not possible to go through other national park files or political decisions on American parks. Files on international connections in this collection end in the early 1970s.

There are some problematic aspects associated with researching these archival materials. For example, it was not always very clear whose opinion was being mentioned in the document—whether something was in line with the National Park Service's views and policies or just a simple mention in a document that did not carry much weight. Putting together a coherent narrative from the files on foreign parks and international co-operation has been time consuming and sometimes quite difficult, as the materials consist of numerous files on various countries and subjects. It was still nonetheless possible to reconstruct a general picture of how the national park idea gradually became articulated as an American invention.

I often refer to the U.S. National Park Service (or the Canadian National Parks Branch) as if it were a single entity, speaking with one voice. In reality, however, any federal agency is of course comprised of a group of people with different voices, operating under many pressures and amid specific external conditions. All of this complexity is hidden when we refer to a federal agency like the National Park Service as the principal actor. However, this level of simplification is necessary when writing about the work of the National Park Service or any similar agency. It is not possible to find out just who thought or did what—and, after all, NPS officials all acted as representatives of the park agency. It is worth noting, too, that publications such as the NPS's national park promotional brochures were often joint efforts, even if they were credited to one person and published under one person's name. As such, they can be taken to represent the NPS's views more broadly. I have written more on using promotional publications as sources elsewhere.[36]

[36] Paula Johanna Saari, "Marketing Nature: The Canadian National Parks Branch and Constructing the Portrayal of National Parks in Promotional Brochures, 1936–1970," *Environment and History* 21, 3 (2015): 401–446. Even though the article is on Canadian national park promotion, it can be applied to park promotion in the U.S. as well.

I also researched the archival collections at the Rockefeller Archive Center in Sleepy Hollow, NY. I examined all relevant materials on national park and international conservation meetings in the following record collections: Office of the Messrs. Rockefeller records, Cultural Interests, Series E (FA314); Rockefeller Foundation records, field offices, Paris, RG 6, SG 1 (FA395); Rockefeller Brothers Fund records (FA005); Ford Foundation records, Grants H-K (FA732D); and American Conservation Association (ACA) records (FA475). Of the collections, only materials in the Ford Foundation records and Rockefeller Brothers Fund records proved useful for this study.

I have also utilized a selection of Canadian national park files in this study, obtained from Record Group 84, Records of the Canadian Parks Service, located at Library and Archives Canada, in Ottawa.

Chapter 4 is based on a large amount of Finnish archival materials, published documents, and parliamentary discussions. Since the study focuses on the international work of the U.S. National Park Service and the transnational construction of national park as an American idea, I have dealt with Finland's national park history and the development of the country's parks system *only* as it relates to the actual subject and scope of my project. Therefore, this chapter is not a complete account of the national park idea, park development, or nature conservation in Finland—rather, I have focused on tracing the influences and international dimensions connected to national parks in Finland. For this reason, many important developments in Finland's national parks system are referred to only very briefly—there is not enough space here to discuss Finnish matters more deeply, and it would also detract from the focus of the study. This is also not a comprehensive account of Finland's international connections or influences in the field of nature conservation (as there were of course connections to other countries and other influences—but the U.S. emerged as the biggest influence in the field of national parks during the post-war period).

My source materials for chapter 4 include, for example, various archival collections as well as conservationists' writings and other publications. As my main interest is the national park *idea*, I have focused on sources that reveal its development and articulate the meaning of the national park idea. I do not look at the day-to-day management or development of national parks per se or examine legislation pertaining

to them in great detail. Therefore, for example, the Records of the Government Counselor for the Conservation of Nature (Valtion luonnonsuojeluvalvojan arkisto) and the Finnish Association for Nature Conservation (Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistys/later Suomen luonnonsuojeluliitto) are more important than those of the State Board of Forestry (Metsähallitus) because they better show the intellectual influences on national parks and the work that was being done to develop them. The Government Counselor[37] for the Conservation of Nature was a post held at the Finnish Forest Research Institute (Metsätieteellinen tutkimuslaitos). The Counselor was basically the official responsible for nature conservation, its development, and the distribution of information. One special part of the job was the development of natural and national parks.[38] I have used the translation "the State Board of Forestry" for Metsähallitus, even though it does not have an official English translation, as this term nicely illustrates the rather peculiar position of the State Board of Forestry: it was a state bureau in charge of the management of most national parks (from the 1950s onwards) but at the same time also in the forestry business.[39] It is worth pointing out, then, that it was not comparable to the U.S. National Park Service or the U.S. Forest Service, and I have therefore focused on those officials and associations that were concerned with nature conservation and the development of national parks and often heavily criticized the State Board of Forestry for its use and destruction of the nature it should have been conserving. I have focused on the writings of the Government Counselors of Nature Conservation and looked at the growing American influence on Finnish national parks as seen through their changing articulations of the national park idea, since such officials were central to defining and developing the idea.

[37] "Controller" would be a more correct translation, but I have retained the term "counselor" as it was the English term used in the archival materials.

[38] For example, for the post-war years it is more important to examine Reino Kalliola's work as the longtime Government Counselor for Nature Conservation than that of many other park authorities (who were tasked with managing the parks but were not necessarily that interested in the development of the national park idea or its intellectual dimensions), because as the Government Counselor for Nature Conservation, Kalliola's job included supervising the interests of nature conservation, such as proposing initiatives and making suggestions for nature conservation measures, giving instructions to people, and educating them on nature conservation matters. The counselor also had a central role in developing national and natural parks. Therefore, it was natural for the government counselor to be one of the two Finnish representatives chosen to attend, for example, the world conferences on national parks.

[39] For more information on Metsähallitus, see Antti Parpola and Veijo Åberg, *Metsävaltio: Metsähallitus ja Suomi 1859–2009* (Helsinki: Edita, 2009).

For this study, I consulted the relevant records of the State Board of Forestry (Metsähallituksen arkisto) at the National Archives (Kansallisarkisto), but they did not provide useful material for my study. Therefore, the study is based on the Records of the Finnish Forest Research Institute (Metsäntutkimuslaitoksen arkisto) and the Records of the Finnish Association for Nature Conservation (Suomen Luonnonsuojeluliiton arkisto) at the National Archives (Kansallisarkisto); as well as the Records of the Government Counselor for the Conservation of Nature (Valtion luonnonsuojeluvalvojan arkisto) at the Ministry of the Environment (Ympäristöministeriö)—a collection that is currently at the National Archives (Kansallisarkisto).

I researched the Records of the Government Counselor for the Conservation of Nature (Valtion luonnonsuojeluvalvojan arkisto) in early 2014, when they were still at the Ministry of the Environment. At the time, finding and accessing the records was not easy, as the collection was housed in the basement of the Ministry and had not been organized and archived properly. After I researched the collection at the Ministry of the Environment (Ympäristöministeriö), the collection was soon moved to the National Archives (Kansallisarkisto).

Outline of Chapters

The study is organized into four chapters. The first chapter provides a chronological view of the early national park creation and promotional work in the United States up to 1945, and it also addresses the initial creation of national parks in certain other countries. The chapter examines the beginning of the national park idea in the United States and its early definitions, as well as national park creation abroad, noting the national variations in national parks. It also discusses the U.S. National Park Service's early international work. The chapter argues that the park idea was not born fully formed at Yellowstone in 1872, that there were many different park beginnings around the globe, but also that the National Park Service took an interest in foreign parks early on and also assumed an advisory role on how to define and organize national parks. Hence, no single unchanging idea about national parks existed since the founding of Yellowstone, but rather the national park idea developed over time and began to be

articulated more and more as an American contribution. National parks in foreign countries often derived from other sources but came to look to the U.S. for inspiration, and the United States was interested in influencing park development in other countries.

The second chapter is thematically centered on international conservation co-operation, cultural diplomacy, and park programs during the Cold War. The chapter argues that the national park idea was connected to the Cold War cultural diplomacy and modernization agenda of the United States and that promoting the national park idea as an American idea during the Cold War strengthened its Americanness. The chapter examines how the national park idea as a distinctly American idea quickly gained ground and took on new meanings after the Second World War and became a cultural export. The park idea was connected to advancing the democratic progress of nations and heavily promoted as an American invention internationally. This chapter looks at American connections with Japanese national parks, the World Conferences on National Parks, as well as the work of foundations in financing international co-operation on national park matters. Promoting Yellowstone as a cultural icon and the world's first national park and promoting the national park idea as a particularly American idea had much to do with the general Cold War situation and cultural diplomacy. During the Cold War years, the national park idea could be used to give a positive image of the United States to the rest of the world, and American development and modernization efforts could be connected to the export of the park idea as well. I will also examine a rather curious program for exporting the park idea, one aimed at African college students in the U.S. The National Park Service has not traditionally advertised parks to African Americans or Latinos. National parks have been very white places. However, as I will demonstrate, national parks were marketed to African students during the Cold War era. This is very significant, as it shows that even though African Americans were not a targeted audience of American national parks, the national park idea was such a useful export that it was still marketed to African students to give them a deeper and more favorable image of the United States and inspire them to promote the national park idea in their home countries.

The third chapter focuses on the narrative of national parks as an American invention and Yellowstone National Park as the birthplace of all national parks. Firstly, I examine the American relationship with wilderness, then the importance

of the story of Yellowstone's discovery for international park history, and finally the somewhat different history of Canadian national parks when it came to international co-operation. I start by looking at the development of the American national park system up to the 1960s, with wilderness preservation gaining more attention. From this point, I move on to examine wilderness appreciation as—arguably—a special American trait and the importance of upholding and reinforcing the narrative of Yellowstone as the beginning of all parks worldwide. I will show that the national park idea as an American idea with its beginnings at Yellowstone was a carefully crafted and skillfully utilized story and that many officials considered it important to uphold this narrative. The national park idea had connections to American wilderness ideals and was a useful positive aspect of American culture. The final part of the chapter provides a brief comparative look at Canadian national parks and the Canadian National Parks Branch's post-war international connections and co-operation. The chapter shows that the Canadian national parks agency too was internationally minded in its national park work but much less so than the United States. Canada had similar international training and park co-operation programs, but not similar motives connected to the national park idea. Looking at Canadian international co-operation initiatives and transnational exchanges shows the differences from American international work, highlighting the unique international character of American international programs and the way in which Americans argued that the national park idea was an American invention. Examining the correspondence between the U.S. and Canada on national park matters also underscores how the national park idea was jointly developed by the two countries and understood as being of larger significance.

The fourth chapter serves as a sort of national case study on the impact of American park programs and their international influence by examining the transformation of the national park idea in one European country—Finland.[40] I argue that the national park idea was constructed as an American idea in Finland during the

[40] As my intention is not to examine the development of the Finnish national park system comprehensively as such, but only as it relates to the actual topic of my research, the international influence and connections of the U.S. National Park Service and how the national park idea was constructed and marketed as "America's best idea," the reader might also be interested in consulting general accounts that discuss the developments of nature conservation, including national parks, in Finland. These include Jyrki Heimonen and Jani Kaaro (eds.), *Luonto-Liiton historia 1943–1998: Jatkosodan varjosta Jerisjärven tielle* (Helsinki: Luonto-Liitto, 1999); Helena Telkänranta, *Laulujoutsenen perintö: Suomalaisen ympäristöliikkeen taival* (Helsinki: WSOY, 2008). A good academic overview of the topic, however, is missing.

Cold War through international park co-operation. This demonstrates the importance of the transnational dimension very well. By focusing on one country and taking a close look at the "Americanization" of the national park idea in that country, we gain a good idea of how the programs presented in earlier chapters had a real impact. Naturally, I do not claim that Finland is representative of all countries in terms of the influence of American park ideals. However, it provides a fitting example of what I am studying here: namely, the process by which the national park idea became constructed as an American invention after the creation of the National Park Service in 1916 and more forcefully during the Cold War, *even* in countries like Finland, which had previously had totally different models and influences for its national parks. The case of Finland is a useful window into how foreign countries were willing to participate internationally and adopt the American beginnings of the national park idea. Despite the German influence in the early stages of national parks in Finland, the country turned to the United States for guidance in the post-war period. Finland also understood the larger value of the international dimension to national park development and the values inherent in national parks—which the U.S. had already been promoting. While the Finnish conservationists of the late 19th century and early 20th century knew of American national parks and their basic features and while Nordenskiöld might have been familiar with Yellowstone, his proposal for creating national parks was still an idea that was considered essentially national in origin and it served as the foundation for the Finnish national park system up until the Cold War years, before park officials adopted the story that all parks somehow derived from Yellowstone. This was undoubtedly enabled and aided by the Finnish conservationists' international connections and growing transnational park co-operation, as well as American park programs and events that promoted this narrative.

Chapter 1

Promoting Parks: The National Park Idea in the United States and Abroad before the Second World War

Even though the National Park Service's park programs and international national park co-operation activities ultimately promoted Yellowstone as the beginning of the national park idea, it is not easy to pinpoint the exact time when the concept of a "national park" was actually born. The national park idea was not born fully formed at Yellowstone—rather, there were several earlier articulations of the idea and the idea also has not remained unchanged; it has been constantly changing and developing. I argue that national parks were not necessarily an American invention in the beginning, as other countries had their own park histories and influences, but that the U.S. National Park Service and the American national park idea became influential only later.

I will first discuss the early definitions of the national park idea to demonstrate that there was no real consensus on when the idea was born or what national parks even really meant in practice. I will then look at how the park idea was developed and promoted in the United States up to the Second World War to show that it was repeatedly being redefined to suit the changing times and society's needs as well as actively promoted in its own country.

After focusing on how the national park idea was first articulated and how it developed in the United States, I will briefly address some national park creation measures abroad to show that the United States was not necessarily a model in the beginning, but became viewed as such only later. Early European national parks were much more directed towards nature preservation and scientific research, while American parks were heavily invested in recreation and tourism. While Yellowstone was already seen as a preservationist model too, it was only during the Cold War years that the United States really started to take the lead in conservation co-operation efforts and really take an interest in articulating the national park as an American invention.

The last sub-chapter will delve into the early international work and connections of the U.S. National Park Service to explore how it took an interest in

finding out about parks in other countries, how other countries began to ask the U.S. Park Service for advice, and also how American park authorities began to articulate the park idea as an American invention that had been adopted in other countries.

1.1. What Is a "National Park"? Creating, Defining, and Developing the Idea

> Through the decades, as the national park concept gained strength and other nations followed the American example, the Madison Junction campfire emerged as the legendary birthplace not just of Yellowstone but of all the world's national parks. Although the Yosemite Valley had been established as a California state park from federally donated lands in 1864 and the term "national park" had been occasionally used in the past, the belief that the national park idea truly began around a wilderness campfire at the Madison Junction evolved into a kind of creation myth: that from a gathering of explorers on a late summer evening in the northern Rocky Mountains came the inspiration for Yellowstone National Park, the prototype for hundreds of similar parks and reserves around the world. In the wilderness setting and with a backdrop of the vast, dramatic landscape of the western frontier, the origin of the national park idea seemed fitting and noble. Surely the national park concept deserved a "virgin birth"—under a night sky in the pristine American West, on a riverbank, and around a flaming campfire, as if an evergreen cone had fallen near the fire, then heated and expanded and dropped its seeds to spread around the planet.[41]

As park historian Richard West Sellars notes, the American creation of national parks, and especially the founding of Yellowstone National Park in 1872, have been given a mythical position. However, the first realization of the national park concept was not a matter of merely setting aside magnificent nature and making it off limits for resource

[41] Richard West Sellars, *Preserving Nature in the National Parks: A History* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1997), 8. On the campfire myth, see Paul Schullery and Lee H. Whittlesey, *Myth and History in the Creation of Yellowstone National Park* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2003). Schullery and Whittlesey provide a thorough account of how the campfire story was created and how it gained influence, also examining the problems with the credibility of the story.

extraction, but part of a much more complex process. Early national parks, rather than being created for the intrinsic value of preserving wilderness, were created with other motivating factors in mind—the romantic preference for sublime landscapes, nationalism connected to nature, and most importantly, the desire to secure control of the area's tourism development and its economic benefits. National parks were also not only an American invention, as Canadian practices were certainly influencing the U.S. national park system in the early 1900s—not just the other way around. National parks were created in the first two decades of the twentieth century also in Sweden (1909) and Switzerland (1914). The German conservation tradition has been influential for national parks in many countries and, for example, Britain had many different park traditions (such as game parks and landscape parks) from early on. The United States has, however, notably made the strongest claim to the idea of national parks, popularly referred to as "America's Best Idea," and Yellowstone National Park has been almost a mythical point of reference in other countries setting up their own park systems.

However, despite the importance vested in Yellowstone and its creation story, the beginning point of the park idea is not as clear as it might seem.[42] It has been noted that "The origins of the national park idea are the subject of considerable academic speculation. Suffice it to say, however, the concept did not originate over a Wyoming campfire."[43] Nonetheless, this very idea provided a powerful narrative for American national parks, one that would be echoed abroad as well, reducing a more complex history into a convenient story.

The fact that it is not easy to attach a definite beginning point to the national park idea shows the fluidity and the almost accidental nature of the park idea. In the United States, there had been many proposals for a "national park" that pre-dated Yellowstone. In 1832, the well-known painter George Catlin proposed the creation of a "Nation's Park" for Native Americans and bison. Granted, this was a slightly different kind of a preservation idea, as it blended together the preservation of nature and indigenous peoples (who would not be present in the American national parks, when

[42] On the many possible "beginning" points, see Sellars, *Preserving Nature in the National Parks*, 7–14, and the recent reflection by Paul S. Sutter, "Geographies of Hope: Lessons from a World of National Parks," in *National Parks Beyond the Nation: Global Perspectives on "America's Best Idea"*, ed. Adrian Howkins, Jared Orsi, and Mark Fiege (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2016), 278–296.
[43] Lary Dilsaver (ed.), *America's National Park System: The Critical Documents* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1994), 7.

national parks were later created, as park creation in its American form entailed the—often violent—removal of indigenous peoples from park lands[44]). During the same year, Arkansas Hot Springs was protected as a federal reservation. A more serious contestant to Yellowstone as holding the status of the "first national park" was Yosemite. Yosemite Valley in California was set aside as a state park in 1864 and, being a large park with monumental scenery and wilderness setting ideal for a national park, it is often considered as offering the first glimpse of the fledgling park idea, even if it was a state park—not actually a national park. It was hoped that Yosemite would become a tourist attraction comparable to European destinations.[45]

As can be noted, there were earlier candidates for the origin of the national park idea than the tale that began at the Madison Junction campfire in September 1870. According to the famous narrative of the creation of Yellowstone National Park, the Washburn-Doane Expedition camped near Madison Junction and admired the landscapes they had been exploring. They considered the profits that could be made from the Yellowstone area, but ultimately they rejected the idea of private exploitation, following Cornelius Hedges's suggestion that the area be set aside and preserved as a public park.[46] (As will be discussed later, when it was time to celebrate Yellowstone's centennial, even the NPS was not quite sure whether this account should be used or not, as its credibility could not be verified—but this was an extremely popular story and readily recounted abroad by foreign park officials as well.) Ultimately, on March 1, 1872, Yellowstone was "dedicated and set apart as a public park or pleasuring-ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people," as noted in its enabling legislation.[47] Interestingly, then, Yellowstone was called a "public park," but the term "national park" was preferred by Superintendent Nathaniel Langford and used by a local newspaper.[48]

---

[44] See Mark David Spence, *Dispossessing the Wilderness: Indian Removal and the Making of the National Parks* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Karl Jacoby, *Crimes against Nature: Squatters, Poachers, Thieves, and the Hidden History of American Conservation* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2001).

[45] See Dilsaver, *America's National Park System*, 11–27, for Yosemite Act and landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted's ideas for Yosemite.

[46] Sellars, *Preserving Nature in the National Parks*, 7–11.

[47] "An Act to Set Apart a Certain Tract of Land Lying Near the Headwaters of the Yellowstone River as a Public Park," Approved March 1, 1872 (17 Stat. 32), in Dilsaver, *America's National Park System*, 28–29.

[48] Karen Jones, "Unpacking Yellowstone: The American National Park in Global Perspective," in *Civilizing Nature: National Parks in Global Historical Perspective*, ed. Bernhard Gissibl, Sabine Höhler, and Patrick Kupper (New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2012), 33.

As has often been pointed out, Yellowstone was called a national park, quite simply, because it was on federal land. Had the territory of Wyoming already been incorporated in to the union as a state, Yellowstone might just as likely have been called a state park like Yosemite. Therefore, Yellowstone's "national park" status was more a coincidence than the articulation of a clear and defined novel idea.

Despite Yellowstone's later importance and influence, passing the legislation that established it as a national park did not generate much interest in Congress or provide a definition of what was meant by the park. Furthermore, the park's great size, for example, was not motivated by preservationist reasons.[49] Yellowstone was not soon followed by a flurry of similar parks (as Richard West Sellars notes, "Yellowstone came close to becoming a historical anomaly rather than a trendsetter in public land policy"[50]); rather, it was only from the early 1900s onwards that more national parks were created and the parks system started becoming more coherent. For example, the prominent Scottish-born preservationist John Muir was one early promoter of the national parks system. In his 1901 book *Our National Parks*, Muir wrote about "Wild Parks and Forest Reservations of the West," not making a clear distinction between the two.[51] The Antiquities Act of 1906 enabled the protection of historic landmarks on small parcels of land,[52] which enabled the president to set aside natural curiosities as well, some of which later became national parks.[53] Railroad tourism had been important since the late nineteenth century, and in the 1910s the arrival of automobiles in national parks provided more opportunities for their public use. Early parks were characterized by remarkable natural features and curiosities.

The national park system was finally organized under a federal agency in 1916. The establishment of the National Park Service provided some definition for national parks, as the Yellowstone Act had not really defined what was meant by such a park. The Organic Act of 1916 noted that the service was established to

[49] For a more detailed account, see Sellars, *Preserving Nature in the National Parks*, 9–10.
[50] Sellars, *Preserving Nature in the National Parks*, 11.
[51] John Muir, *Our National Parks* (Boston, 1901), 1.
[52] "An Act for the Preservation of American Antiquities," Approved June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225), in Dilsaver, *America's National Park System*, 40–41.
[53] Sellars, *Preserving Nature in the National Parks*, 13–14.

> promote and regulate the use of the Federal areas know as national parks, monuments, and reservations, which purpose is to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and the wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.[54]

Even here, though, the government did not articulate a clear national park idea that was born at Yellowstone. The act lumped together all sorts of protected areas. It did, however, contain the dual mandate of use and preservation, the balance of which would guide the management of national parks. The establishment of the National Park Service is another milestone in American national park history. It is often told as yet another, almost mythical story, with suitable heroes: J. Horace McFarland, Frederick Law Olmsted Jr., Stephen T. Mather, and Horace M. Albright, all of whom brought different kinds of expertise to the project.[55]

During the following years, the national park system developed in great strides. Automobile traffic to the parks increased together with growing interest in outdoor recreation in the 1920s. In the 1930s, the Great Depression affected national park visitation but had a positive effect on the construction and expansion of the parks system: for example, the Civilian Conservation Corps program provided a workforce for many National Park Service projects, helping construct the parks and their facilities.[56] National parks and their relationship to and emphasis on preservation, use, development and concessionaires, and scientific research were in a constant state of flux and redefinition as the park system developed and was enlarged. Thus, the national park idea was repeatedly evolving over time.

The growth and development of the park system would not have been possible without the growing political and public support for parks. To ensure its continuity and sufficient operational resources, the National Park Service needed to publicize the parks to make politicians understand the economic value of selling

[54] "An Act to Establish a National Park Service, and for Other Purposes," Approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535), in Dilsaver, *America's National Park System*, 46–47.
[55] For more on the creation of the National Park Service, see Sellars, *Preserving Nature in the National Parks*, 28–46.
[56] For a brief discussion of national parks during the New Deal years, see Dilsaver, *America's National Park System*, 111–113.

scenery, and through promoting the use of parks, safeguard their other purposes. The national park idea was not immediately supported and celebrated as a great American invention by all; rather, it had to be heavily promoted by the park authorities in order to make the general public to adopt the idea of nature preservation and see its benefits.

One important promoter was Robert Sterling Yard. Yard, originally a New York journalist and publisher, was invited to Washington D.C. by Stephen Mather to work as an advocate for national parks in 1915. Yard's *National Parks Portfolio*, first published in 1916, was sent to members of Congress and—along with other publicity measures directed by Mather and Yard—it aided in the creation of the National Park Service.[57] The *National Parks Portfolio*'s[58] main purpose was to showcase and argue for the importance of national parks in the United States. In promoting the tourism possibilities of national parks, *the Portfolio* connected national identity with visiting the parks. Yard described national parks as if they were a coherent system as opposed to the more haphazard collection of areas they actually were. National park promotion was also connected to the larger campaign of promoting U.S. tourist destinations to American tourists. With the slogan "see America first," citizens were urged to be patriotic and visit the nation's sights and scenic wonders, strengthening the connections between tourism and national identity.[59]

The National Parks Portfolio did not really suggest that national parks were a completely novel idea. Instead, it connected the parks to tourism practices already prevalent in Europe. In the introduction, Secretary of the Interior Franklin K. Lane noted, that "There is no reason why this Nation should not make its public health and scenic domain as available to all its citizens as Switzerland and Italy make theirs."[60] Citing Yellowstone, Lane noted that "nature has made of it the largest and most populous game preserve in the Western Hemisphere,"[61] while also writing of the area's tourism possibilities. Officials at the time connected Yellowstone more to older ideas like game preserves and European tourist destinations rather than arguing that it

[57] For more on Yard, see Paul S. Sutter, *Driven Wild: How the Fight against Automobiles Launched the Modern Wilderness Movement* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2002), 100–141.
[58] Robert Sterling Yard, *The National Parks Portfolio,* 2nd ed. (Washington, D.C.: Govt. print. off., 1917).
[59] On the connections of tourism promotion and national identity, see Marguerite S. Shaffer, *See America First*: *Tourism and National Identity 1880–1940* (Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2001), especially chapter 3 on national parks.
[60] Yard, *National Parks Portfolio*, 3.
[61] Ibid., 4.

represented a completely different type of invention. Yard, too, described Yellowstone, among other things, as "by far the largest and most successful wild-animal preserve in the world."[62] *The Portfolio* covered each park, highlighting the magnificent nature, wild animals, leisure activities, and comfortable accommodations to be found at each. The focus was on showcasing the majestic views found within the existing parks to gather support for national parks. As Director Mather noted, "This nation is richer in natural scenery of the first order than any other nation; but it does not know it."[63] It is worth noting that the publication did not so much emphasize the novelty of the national park idea, but rather it sought to promote the parks by selling to the general public older, more familiar ideas (such as game preservation and tourism) with a twist.

Glimpses of Our National Parks was a pamphlet printed for the general public and distributed for free. Robert Sterling Yard's 1916 booklet noted that national parks were "not parks in the common meaning of the word." Rather, they were "large areas which nature, not man, has made beautiful and which the hand of man alters only enough to provide roads to enter them, trails to penetrate their fastness, and hotels and camps to live in." He noted that "considered together, they [the national parks] contain more features of conspicuous grandeur than are readily accessible in all the rest of the world together."[64] American national parks contained many natural curiosities unmatched anywhere else in the world. Notably, the section on Yellowstone boasted about how its geysers beat those of the rest of the world, but nowhere did the pamphlet mention that Yellowstone was the first national park in the world.[65] The publication had a wide distribution. For example, in 1917 it was noted that 117,000 copies of it had been distributed.[66] The international perspective in publications at this stage consisted only of comparisons to other countries—their natural features and tourism.

New editions of *Glimpses of Our National Parks* were published by the National Park Service in the following decades before the Second World War. These editions were revised and updated versions of Yard's original text. In the 1920s, *Glimpses of Our National Parks* suggested America's national parks were famous internationally, however not because they were the first parks in the world but because

[62] Ibid., [page number missing].
[63] Yard, *National Parks Portfolio*, 5.
[64] Robert Sterling Yard, *Glimpses of Our National Parks* (Washington, Govt. print. off., 1916), 3.
[65] Ibid., 14–15.
[66] Sutter, *Driven Wild*, 100.

of their unrivalled natural features, which would in the future make them a source of income for the U.S. Under the heading "An Economic Asset," the booklet noted: "It is plain that our national parks, with very few exceptions, have a quality so unusual that they are destined some day to become more celebrated internationally than the Swiss Alps are to-day." The booklet continued, "The Alps exhibit only granite scenery while our national parks show the full range of granitic, volcanic, and sedimentary scenery in world-famous examples."[67]

In the 1930s and 1940s, the booklets were revised and expanded by Isabelle F. Story from the Office of Information. It was during these decades that the booklet began suggesting that the entire world had followed the U.S. example in establishing national parks. The famous campfire narrative with Cornelius Hedges's suggestion opened the 1934 edition of the booklet. The booklet noted that the members of the expedition discussed land claims to the Yellowstone area: "Then came the momentous suggestion that resulted in the creation of our national parks and those of the whole world." National parks were a "unique idea" and "a new conception of land use." They were described as "a major land use, vital to the well-being of the people of the nation and to the preservation of our biological resources." Shortly thereafter, it was again noted: "The entire world has followed the example of the United States, and today national parks or similar reservations exist on every continent, and in almost any country of any size."[68] The booklet painted an ideal picture of park creation, noting that "No consideration of commercial interest enters into park creation";[69] rather, the writer stressed the noble purposes and practices of national parks in writing about national park ideals. The 1941 edition was published along the same lines.[70] This is noteworthy, as these publications were sent abroad after receiving requests for information from other countries. Therefore, both the American public and foreign park officials were educated through these booklets that the national park idea was an American idea that had been born at Yellowstone.

How the national park idea was articulated and promoted in books and promotional publications perhaps provides an even better window into the definitions

[67] National Park Service, *Glimpses of Our National Parks* (Washington, D.C.: G.P.O, 1929), 5.
[68] National Park Service, *Glimpses of Our National Parks* (Washington, D.C.: G.P.O, 1934), 1–2.
[69] Ibid., 2.
[70] National Park Service, *Glimpses of Our National Parks* (Washington, D.C.: G.P.O, 1941), 2.

and redefinitions of the park concept than do the actual parks that were created or the ways in which the park system was developed. As I have argued elsewhere,[71] national park promotional publications are an excellent reflection of what was meant by the concept of a "national park" during different times. Even in cases where political battles, economic restrictions, or changing scenic ideals might have affected park creation or development on the ground, promotional literature on national parks could craft the parks anew to fit whichever ideals. The publications provided the basic information about national parks so they could be sent abroad as well.[72]

Robert Sterling Yard was a leading figure in the National Parks Association—an independent organization advocating in favor of the national parks system—which was founded in 1919 and began fighting for national parks' scenic standards and promoting their educational value. His work *The Book of National Parks* (originally published in 1919) upheld high standards for national parks and highlighted the ancient geological processes that had created their most magnificent features. This is an apt example of the fact that there was no real consensus on exactly how to define parks during this time. "The idea still widely obtains that our national parks are principally playgrounds," noted Yard. "This view," according to him, "entirely misses the point." He then explained that national parks were something much more. They were "the gallery of masterpieces."[73]

Indeed, one interesting testimony to the malleability and fluid nature of the national park idea was that different groups often held quite different ideas on the purpose of national parks. Interestingly, though, even if other groups differed from the NPS's ideals, they could still argue that the park idea was a great American export abroad. The National Parks Association is a good example of the fact that many different ideas about the intent of national parks could simultaneously coexist. Even though the NPS's descriptions of parks focused on showcasing the top quality of park landscapes, the National Park Association's views on what kind of areas made for national park material were stricter. This Association focused on upholding scenic

[71] Paula Johanna Saari, "Marketing Nature: The Canadian National Parks Branch and Constructing the Portrayal of National Parks in Promotional Brochures, 1936–1970," *Environment and History* 21, 3 (2015): 401–446.
[72] It is worth noting, too, that publications often were joint efforts, even if credited to one person, and as such, can be taken to represent the NPS's views more broadly.
[73] Robert Sterling Yard, *The Book of the National Parks* (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921), 20.

standards for national parks. Its work also shows how the American national park idea was considered of international importance. In replying to threats from a new national parks policy that had been revealed, the National Parks Association used the argument that the national park idea was America's trademark internationally to make the case that national parks should not be downgraded to mere recreational areas. "Touch not this trade-mark," the *NPA Bulletin* began in February 1923, "A Business-Maker in America, and a National Income-Producer from Abroad, the Trade-Mark 'National Parks of America' is fast Becoming as Famous, the world over, as 'The Alps.' Do Nothing to Impair its Value." Quite simply, the National Parks Association noted, "Our National Parks System has become the world's model." According to the NPA's account, many countries had subsequently followed America's lead in creating parks. The NPA explained that the fame of America's national parks came from what they possessed—magnificent scenery—and they should not be turned into mere recreational grounds with lesser landscape standards. This was important from a tourism standpoint. The NPA offered the following proof: "Steamship companies are working to fill eastbound ships with tourists from Europe, and, in their business-seeking, are finding the 'National Parks of America' their top-line slogan." Finally, "America's Best is the World's Best," and no lower grade parks should be admitted to the national park system as this would "weaken its trade-mark."[74]

It is notable how already in 1923, the international cachet of the American national park idea could be used in its own country to argue for the importance of national parks and the importance of keeping the system a certain way. Even if the NPA's suggestions of the importance of the national park idea to the United States seem a little exaggerated, this is a useful example of articulating the park idea as an American invention and how that was used for national goals by attaching larger monetary and tourism value to the parks.

What is noteworthy here, then, is that there was not a set moment in time when the national park idea was born, nor was there even really a proper definition or consensus on what a national park was (and in any case, this was always developing), and finally, this was an American idea based distinctly on American conditions. After the Civil War, in the midst of continental expansion and in a nationalistic spirit, the

[74] National Parks Association, *National Parks Bulletin* 32 (7 February 1923).

United States—lacking the cultural heritage of Europe—created natural monuments that would match the cultural relics (like castles, for example) of the Old World, also motivated by the Romantic movement and artistic depictions of wilderness. The U.S. then developed its parks to match society's needs in the following decades, responding to demands created by increasing visitor numbers as well as depression and wartime conditions, for example. The national park idea was celebrated as an American symbol also to safeguard parks and combat the wartime intrusions on their inviolability. During the Second World War, Director Newton Drury defended the value of national parks, and by "Drawing upon letters from servicemen overseas he painted an image of parks as icons for America to be preserved pure and unabused for their inspiration."[75] In the United States, then, it was initially understandably more important to promote national parks at the national level in order to justify their existence, and only then to make an international impact by exporting the idea abroad.

1.2. Not Just an American Idea: National Park Creation Abroad

National parks were created in other countries as well, in some of them already in the late 1800s and in many more starting from the early 1900s. Foreign parks, despite being aware of Yellowstone, often had national beginnings, which were sometimes quite different from the U.S. and not really connected to it, deriving instead from national history, different natural conditions, and other specific national needs. As Thomas Dunlap has noted, "This [the national park idea] now seems an American idea; park histories throughout the Anglo world appeal to the act establishing Yellowstone National Park in 1872 as the fountainhead of the movement. This is hindsight and bad history."[76] As this chapter will demonstrate via several examples, national park creation abroad was at times quite dissimilar and did not necessarily derive from the Yellowstone example. It is exactly the construction of this story, in which Yellowstone became *the origin* of all parks globally, that is the point of focus in this study.

In this sub-chapter, I look at foreign national parks created in the early 1900s and the American influence—or lack thereof—on them. I will first look at

[75] Dilsaver, *America's National Park System*, 165.
[76] Thomas R. Dunlap, *Nature and the English Diaspora: Environment and History in the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999), 118.

Canada, which was a special case highlighting not only the early American influence but also the shared development of the national park idea. Outlining certain developments in national park creation around the world will suggest that the national park idea was not necessarily exported from the United States, as park beginnings in, for example, Mexico, Switzerland, and Finland (in chapter 4) show; rather, the park idea was only later created as an American idea, with the National Park Service celebrating Yellowstone as the spark for the global spread of the national park idea. Initially, national parks abroad had origins and purposes that were quite different from their American counterparts. I will pay special attention to the case of Finland in chapter 4, as examining this case will help illustrate how even countries with very different park beginnings later turned to American ideas and began to view the park idea as an American invention.

Canada created its first park in 1885. Rocky Mountains Park—later known as Banff National Park—was officially established in 1887, its founding act echoing the Yellowstone precedent. The Dominion Parks Branch (later the National Parks Branch, nowadays Parks Canada) was created in 1911. Even if Canada beat the United States by five years in creating the world's first federal agency to oversee national parks, Banff's legislation was passed with similar disinterest towards parks in the House of Commons discussions, as had been the case when politicians had discussed the Yellowstone Act in the U.S.[77] The histories of American and Canadian national parks contain many analogies: the two countries have traditionally shared many similar developments, notions of parks, redefinitions of their nature, and have been guided by similar dual mandates of preservation and use. Initially, comparable themes in both countries included, for example, similar landscape ideals and a sense of national pride that guided the early Western parks, as well as the economic importance and early railroad tourism associated with national parks.[78] The close connection between the U.S. and Canada

[77] For Canadian parks history, see Claire Elizabeth Campbell (ed.), *A Century of Parks Canada 1911–2011* (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2011). See also the dated commissioned history, W.F. Lothian, *A Brief History of Canada's National Parks* (Ottawa: Environment Canada, 1987).

[78] On Canadian national parks see also, for example, Alan MacEachern, *Natural Selections: National Parks in Atlantic Canada, 1935–1970* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001); Paul Kopas, *Taking the Air: Ideas and Change in Canada's National Parks* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2007); John Sandlos, "Federal Spaces, Local Conflicts: National Parks and the Exclusionary Politics of the Conservation Movement in Ontario, 1900–1935," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 16, 1 (2005): 293–318. On the exclusion of Native peoples from parks, see Theodore Binnema and Melanie Niemi, "'Let the Line Be Drawn Now': Wilderness, Conservation, and

was not limited to similar conditions or developments in national parks, but also included sharing information and practical tips on, for example, the construction of facilities for parks tourism or managing wildlife and the ecological conditions within parks.

As Alan MacEachern has noted, in the beginning both countries mutually helped and influenced each other in developing the park systems—even though Canada looked to the U.S. for model on many occasions, Americans also followed Canadian developments—often using examples from the other country in a competitive manner, trying to achieve better development and more resources for themselves. It seems, though, that Canadians perhaps placed more importance on having a good relationship with their fellow American park officials. MacEachern argues that "While American park authorities were happy to work with the Canadian ones, they showed no interest in forming a special relationship."[79]

In a way, the United States and Canada were jointly creating, defining and developing the national park idea through their extensive connections. During the early twentieth century, the two countries corresponded extensively on matters relating to the new park systems and helped each other by sharing experiences on various practical, legislative, and ideological issues as well as by exchanging publications and information. For example, the first Canadian commissioner of national parks, James B. Harkin, who served until 1936, had a good relationship with the U.S. National Park Service. This co-operation was perceived as important for both sides. For instance, when Canada opened the Banff-Windermere Highway—a major achievement and an

---

the Exclusion of Aboriginal People from Banff National Park in Canada," *Environmental History* 11, 4 (2006): 724–750; John Sandlos, "Not Wanted in the Boundary: the Expulsion of the Keeseekoowenin Ojibway Band from Riding Mountain National Park," *Canadian Historical Review* 89, 2 (2008): 189–221. Older studies on Canadian parks offer a more limited view, often viewing parks for their preservationist or developmental interests only, consult Janet Foster, *Working for Wildlife: The Beginning of Preservation in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998), and Leslie Bella, *Parks for Profit* (Montreal: Harvest House, 1987). Robert Craig Brown has suggested in his "doctrine of usefulness" thesis that with national parks, the government was simply continuing its policy of making the fullest use of natural resources, see "The Doctrine of Usefulness: Natural Resource and National Park Policy in Canada, 1887–1914," in *Canadian Parks in Perspective: Based on the Conference the Canadian National Parks Today and Tomorrow, Calgary, October 1968*, ed. J.G. Nelson (Montreal: Harvest House, 1975), 46–62.

[79] Alan MacEachern, "Canada's Best Idea? The Canadian and American National Park Services in the 1910s," in *National Parks Beyond the Nation: Global Perspectives on "America's Best Idea"*, ed. Adrian Howkins, Jared Orsi, and Mark Fiege (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2016), 51–67. For an examination of the relationship between the Canadian National Parks Branch and the U.S. National Park Service, see Terence Young, Alan MacEachern, and Lary Dilsaver, "Canada–US Cooperation: From Continental Competitors to Global Partners," forthcoming in *Environment and History*.

important road for national parks tourism—the Canadian authorities invited an official representative from the United States to attend the opening ceremony. Originally, the invitation from Charles Stewart, the Minister of the Interior, was directed to U.S. Secretary of the Interior Hubert Work, then to NPS Director Stephen Mather, both of whom were unable to attend.[80] However, sending an American representative to give a speech at the ceremony was deemed important, as the NPS wished to maintain their good co-operative relations with Canadian park officials. American attendance at the opening of the Banff-Windermere Highway served to reiterate this desire.[81] The Canadian minister, too, assumed a role in articulating the national park idea as a joint effort by noting that the park systems of the two countries were administered "with the same purpose and with the same ideals."[82]

It was decided that J. R. Eakin, Superintendent of (U.S.) Glacier National Park, would participate as a representative of the Department of the Interior and U.S. National Park Service. Eakin's speech described the national park idea as something shared between the two countries—something that transcended national boundaries—and assured the Canadian audience of the good relationship between the countries:

> Your neighbors to the South are almost as interested in your parks as in their own for the conservationist is not greatly impressed with International Boundary lines. He believes that the finest example of each particular type of country should be preserved for posterity. And that, my friends, is the National Park idea—an idea that is growing leaps and bounds. The indifference to International Boundary lines is especially true of our two countries.[83]

[80] Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, to Charles Stewart, Minister of the Interior, Canada, 9 June 1923; Charles Stewart, Minister of the Interior, to Stephen T. Mather, Director, National Parks Service, 21 June 1923, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 630, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Canada, Pt. 1, 1909–23, National Archives and Records Administration [hereafter NARA].
[81] Arno B. Cammerer, Acting Director, National Park Service, to J. Ross Eakin, Superintendent, Glacier National Park, 20 June 1923, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 630, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Canada, Pt. 1, 1909–23, NARA.
[82] Charles Stewart, Minister of the Interior, to Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, 19 June 1923, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 630, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Canada, Pt. 1, 1909–23, NARA.
[83] "Address of supt Eakin at opening of Banff-Windermere highway June 30-1923," RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 630, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Canada, Pt. 1, 1909–23, NARA.

Grand words like these upheld the close working relationship between the two park services. As seen from Superintendent Eakin's speech, he did not—obviously—treat the park idea as an American idea, but rather articulated it as a joint effort by both countries to mark the Canadian occasion. According to his own account, Eakin was treated as an important visitor.[84]

The visit also produced important information for the U.S. National Park Service that could be used in order to argue for greater appropriations for American national parks. Good maintenance of roads was crucial for national parks and American parks—it was noted—should enjoy the same level of support as the Canadian ones in this regard. "It is evident that unless maintenance funds for the American parks are materially increased we cannot hope to compete with the Canadian parks on an even basis," noted Superintendent Eakin to Arno B. Cammerer, the Acting Director of the National Park Service.[85] Eakin's letter to the Secretary of the Interior made this argument even more compellingly: "Until the roads in [U.S.] Glacier National Park are improved, we cannot hope to fulfill our mission as a member of the National Park family."[86] This is just one example of a common practice on both sides of the 49th parallel—to cite monetary figures as well as other developments in order to obtain better funding in one's own country. It can be argued that at this time, national park co-operation and the transnational development of the national park idea were mostly about using international examples to help one's own parks, not yet an international movement that tried to promote universal values (such as democracy) or preservation as the most important aspect of national parks—co-operation was directed to maximizing both park systems' recreational profits. American and Canadian national parks faced many of the same problems and questions, and it seemed like the U.S. was looking abroad mainly for recreational models.

Assistant Director Horace M. Albright made a tour of Canadian national parks in 1926—Mather had toured them in 1924—"to observe certain methods of

[84] J. R. Eakin, Superintendent of Glacier National Park, to the Secretary of the Interior, 7 July 1923, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 630, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Canada, Pt. 1, 1909–23, NARA.
[85] J. R. Eakin, Superintendent of Glacier National Park, to Arno B. Cammerer, Acting Director, National Park Service, 11 August 1923, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 630, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Canada, Pt. 1, 1909–23, NARA.
[86] J. R. Eakin, Superintendent of Glacier National Park, to the Secretary of the Interior, 7 July 1923, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 630, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Canada, Pt. 1, 1909–23, NARA.

protection and administration." Albright offered many complaints about the professionalism of the Canadian parks staff and some other aspects of Canadian parks as well, and on the whole he remarked that he "did not see very much in the operations of the Canadian system that we would want to adopt in our national parks." He had, however, learned many things that should be avoided. Albright did remark that "The Canadian Park officials have a fine spirit and they are proud of their parks and they work hard. They are certainly worthy of any cooperation that we may be able to extend to them ..."[87]

**

The United States had many similarities with the fellow settler societies of Australia and New Zealand in terms of the creation of national parks and the connections between nature and the nation in general. Despite this, and even though the first national parks in those countries were created rather early on—in Australia in 1879 and in New Zealand in 1887—and might have been partly inspired by the example of Yellowstone, they were certainly not copies of the American national park idea, but rather different in their natural features, purposes, and connotations.[88] The U.S. was also not the only country creating a substantial number of national parks. By 1940, there were more national parks in Mexico than in any other country. The Mexican national park idea connected conservation with social justice, creating very different park landscapes than in the United States.[89] Dealings between American and Mexican park authorities and efforts at co-operation in park matters show just how differently these countries thought about national parks.[90]

[87] [Report by Horace Albright on the trip to four Canadian parks], 20 September 1926, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 630, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Canada, Pt. 2, ca. 1924–32, NARA. Quotes from p. 1 and p. 13.

[88] Melissa Harper and Richard White, "How National Were the First National Parks? Comparative Perspectives from the British Settler Societies," in *Civilizing Nature: National Parks in Global Historical Perspective*, ed. Bernhard Gissibl, Sabine Höhler, and Patrick Kupper (New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2012), 50–67; Jones, "Unpacking Yellowstone," 43–44; Dunlap, *Nature and the English Diaspora*, 118–123.

[89] Emily Wakild, *Revolutionary Parks: Conservation, Social Justice, and Mexico's National Parks, 1910–1940* (Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2011).

[90] Emily Wakild, "Border Chasm: International Boundary Parks and Mexican Conservation 1935–1945," *Environmental History* 14, 3 (July 2009): 453–475.

In the early 20th century, national parks were established in Europe. Europe had its own conservation models, too. German biologist Hugo Conwentz's term *Naturdenkmäler* (natural monuments) was influential in early 20th-century European conservation efforts, kind of a local response to the concept of a national park. Natural monuments were single natural features—preserving them was perhaps easier and better suited to heavily settled Central Europe than creating national parks that required large tracts of land. However, some European countries began to establish larger areas as the main means for nature conservation and adopted the American term "national park."[91]

The first European countries to create national parks were Sweden (1909), where the American model was accepted to a large degree, and Switzerland (1914), which took a fairly different approach, while containing familiar traits such as nationalism connected to nature. Though Swiss park planners were familiar with the American national park system, it did not provide a suitable model for the situation in Switzerland. The Swiss National Park was heavily directed towards scientific preservation, in contrast to American national parks, where recreational activities were more important. Switzerland's scientific national park model provided an important alternative ideal for national park creation in Europe in the early 20th century.[92] Swiss park officials, too, were in touch with their American colleagues. The transatlantic exchange of ideas was fruitful, but again revealed the different national beginnings and distinctions within the park idea.[93] The Swiss model provided inspiration for park movements abroad, for example in Germany, Italy, and Russia. In France, too, the country's first national park was based on the scientific Swiss model—and not influenced by Yellowstone.[94] Despite the long history of game parks and landscape parks in the United Kingdom, its first national parks were established relatively late—only in the 1950s. While the North American park model was known in Britain, British

[91] Patrick Kupper, "Translating Yellowstone: Early European National Parks, Weltnaturschutz, and the Swiss Model," in *Civilizing Nature: National Parks in Global Historical Perspective*, ed. Bernhard Gissibl, Sabine Höhler, and Patrick Kupper (New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2012), 123–139.
[92] Patrick Kupper, *Wildnis schaffen: Eine transnationale Geschichte des Schweizerischen Nationalparks* (Bern: Haupt, 2012); Kupper, "Translating Yellowstone," 123–139. On Sweden, see Tom Mels, *Wild Landscapes: The Cultural Nature of Swedish National Parks* (Lund: Lund University Press, 1999).
[93] Patrick Kupper, "Science and the National Parks: A Transatlantic Perspective on the Interwar Years," *Environmental History* 14, 1 (January 2009): 58–81.
[94] Kupper, "Translating Yellowstone," 135; Caroline Ford, "Imperial Preservation and Landscape Reclamation: National Parks and Natural Reserves in French Colonial Africa," in *Civilizing Nature: National Parks in Global Historical Perspective*, ed. Bernhard Gissibl, Sabine Höhler, and Patrick Kupper (New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2012), 72.

national parks did not try to emulate Yellowstone either. National park landscapes in Britain were far different than those across the Atlantic, as they had to incorporate a long, more visible human history.[95]

For foreign countries considering the possibilities and purposes of national parks, Yellowstone and United States were not the only examples to turn to. For example, in 1913 the French Committee of Tourism in the Mountains mentioned Yellowstone as one example of a national park but did not consider the national park idea solely an American idea, listing also Switzerland and New Zealand. Instead, national parks were something that had successively been taken up in numerous countries, and that France should follow. In an article pondering about what the guiding principles for parks in France should be, the purposes of parks were linked to preservation and scientific research.[96] Furthermore, a second article provided a list of national parks that had been created around the world up to 1913. It listed American parks as well as European initiatives: "In 1906, Prussia, in 1908, Sweden, and then successively Norway, Denmark, Java etc. created reservations, making the idea popular." It also described national parks by noting "It will be seen how universal this movement has become…"[97] The writer of the French article seemed to view the national park idea as a distinct movement, but not one particularly connected to or belonging to the United States.

To summarize, Canada had its advanced parks system around the same time as the U.S. Despite being heavily influenced and aided by their southern neighbors, Canadians had a national park service before the U.S. and in many respects the two countries were jointly creating and defining park practices. Even before these developments, there were many nature conservation ideas and preservation initiatives around the world. National parks in other settler societies shared some qualities with Yellowstone, but at the same time they were clearly different national articulations of the national park idea. In Mexico, the national park idea blended conservation and

[95] On British parks, see Karen R. Jones and John Wills, *The Invention of the Park: From the Garden of Eden to Disney's Magic Kingdom* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005), especially 25–36, 82–83.
[96] L. Auscher, President of the Committee of Tourism in the Mountains, "National Parks," Translation from "Revue Mensuelle du Touring Club de France," pp. 100–101, March, 1913, in RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 630, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, France, 1912–30, NARA.
[97] L. Auscher, President of the Committee of Tourism in the Mountains, "National Parks (Second Article)," pp. 197–199, March, 1913, in RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 630, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, France, 1912–30, NARA.

social justice into a distinct kind of national park idea. Switzerland had its own national park model, which focused on scientific preservation. The Swiss National Park also influenced other European countries. Swedish parks seemed to adhere to Yellowstone's example, whereas Finns emphasized the national origins of the country's national park idea and admired German ideas, as American models were not considered suitable. The case of Finland (which will be explored in chapter 4) particularly shows an almost total rejection of American models when the country initially began establishing national parks.

Thus, it can be seen that Yellowstone, even if it was the first conservation area in the world with the label "national park," did not really create a spark or a movement that immediately and unchangeably spread internationally or was exported to other countries. Rather, foreign countries came up with similar initiatives, with varying degrees of influence from Yellowstone. Hence, it cannot be said that the national park idea spread directly after Yellowstone or that national parks abroad were just manifestations of some American invention. It was through international connections and co-operation that the national park idea started to become constructed as an American idea. National parks that did not originally take Yellowstone as a model became connected to it later, as if all parks worldwide had been born at Yellowstone and the movement had spread from there.

1.3. The National Park Service Looks Abroad: The Early Articulations of the National Park Idea as an American Invention

As we have already seen in this chapter, the national park idea was an American idea distinctly for American conditions, whereas national parks in other countries—with the exception of Canada perhaps—were created in different ways and did not necessarily draw influence from Yellowstone. From very early on, however, the U.S. National Park Service had an interest in finding out about foreign parks. It started gathering information about foreign national parks, giving advice to other countries, and ultimately articulating the national park idea as an American invention. The National Park Service improved its knowledge of foreign parks, as many individuals and organizations seemed to expect it to possess this information. It gathered news of

national parks abroad and offered guidance to other countries. In this sense, the NPS correspondence contains early articulations and definitions of the park idea as an American idea.

More formal collection of information started in the early 1920s. In April 1920, the Department of the Interior notified the Secretary of State that the National Park Service had heard of national parks having been established in other countries, too. It was also mentioned that the King of Belgium had taken his model for a national park from the United States. The NPS wished to collect information about park developments abroad and this work could be done through the State Department's representatives in foreign countries.[98] So, in the early 1920s the National Park Service started collecting information about national parks around the world through the State Department via diplomatic channels, setting out to find as much as it could about similar initiatives abroad. Letters were sent to American diplomatic and consular offices asking them to provide information and encouraging them to stay informed about conservation developments in their respective countries.[99]

Based on information gathered in this way, the American park authorities seemed quite well-informed about the park situations in other countries. A report containing information received by the State Department from 1920 to 1927 shows that most of the countries covered did not have equivalents to American national parks. In fact, it is interesting that the report specifically paid attention to whether the foreign conservation areas corresponded to the American realization of national parks. For example, with respect to the situation in Albania, the American report noted: "There are no national parks or natural attractions to be developed as such in this country. The only manifestation of any such movement appears to be a few insignificent [sic] municipal gardens in one or two cities." It was then noted that "There are no national parks in Bulgaria such as exist in the United States." National parks in Sweden, Canada, Argentina, Australia, New Zealand, Switzerland, France, and Italy, for instance, were listed. Greece had "No national parks similar to ours." England had its royal parks

[98] [Illegible signature], First Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, to the Secretary of State, 9 April 1920, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 629, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Belgian Congo, ca. 1930–32, NARA.
[99] Hubert Work, Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of State, 4 December 1926; Second Assistant Secretary of State to the Secretary of the Interior, 24 April 1920, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 629, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Miscellaneous, ca. 1914–32, NARA.

which did "not appear to be similar in character to our national parks."[100] The purposes for which parks were used were also different.

American authorities discovered that national parks in Europe were quite different from those in the United States. In addition to the National Park Service's own efforts to acquire information from abroad, they relied on information gathered by others. Harvey Hall was an American botanist who wrote a significant report on European national parks and equivalent reserves after a year in Europe. The report, subsequently published as an article in the *Journal of Forestry*, was first written to John C. Merriam, who had an active interest in the educational potential of national parks and national park creation abroad.[101] One important source of information was Hall's report on European national parks, the purpose of which read as follows:

> This paper is a report to President J. C. Merriam, of the Carnegie Institution of Washington, made after a preliminary survey in 1928 of some of the more important national parks and other reservations in Europe. It is based upon a personal study of some of the reserves themselves, upon conferences with leaders in the movement, and upon published accounts … It comprises a summary of findings and some suggested applications to American conditions, followed by a report upon each of the countries or regions studied.[102]

Hall's report noted that "The term 'National Park' has a different meaning in Europe from its connotation in America. There it usually signifies an area set aside for educational or scientific purposes, rather than for recreation." One major difference to the park idea in the United States was that in Europe, scientists had taken the lead in proposing parks. European national parks were different and had influenced each other, for example, according to Hall's report, Switzerland had provided a direct influence for the national park idea in Italy in 1919. The report also compared Italian national parks,

[100] "National Parks in Foreign Lands," RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 629, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Miscellaneous, ca. 1914–32, NARA.
[101] Kupper, "Science and the National Parks," 60, 69–71.
[102] "European Reservations for the Protection of Natural Conditions" By H. M. Hall, Carnegie Institution of Washington, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 629, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Miscellaneous, ca. 1914–32, NARA.

together with their purposes and functions, to American national parks and national forests. It also noted how much the Swiss realization of the national park idea differed from American parks. The Swiss park was noted for having been established with nature protection, not enjoyment by the public, as its foremost goal.[103] The NPS considered Hall's report "most interesting."[104] The report—alongside the information gathered through the State Department—seemed to form a good basis for the agency's knowledge of foreign parks. For example, some country reports in the NPS's files clearly derived directly from Hall's report. It is interesting that at this point, the National Park Service was seeking to learn from abroad and apply information from foreign parks to the U.S. situation—not particularly to promote the American park idea abroad. As Patrick Kupper has noted of the U.S.-Swiss exchange, the U.S. was at this time mostly interested in foreign examples for organizing recreation, not scientific research. Even though the National Park Service looked to Switzerland for a model, it was only interested in learning from the country's tourism industry and applying Swiss-style designs to American national parks.[105]

Even if the U.S. had created the first national park, Europe—especially Switzerland—was more advanced when it came to scientific preservation in national parks. The Swiss National Park influenced park creation in other European countries, such as Italy, Russia, and Germany, as well. For example, in the 1920s Switzerland's role in influencing other countries was acknowledged in an article by Ansel F. Hall, Chief Naturalist for the U.S. National Park Service. He noted that "Switzerland is really responsible for the beginning of the parks movement in Italy," and he described the direct influence of the Swiss National Park on the idea of national parks in Italy.[106] As can be seen here, some countries rejected the tourism focus of American national parks.

The National Park Service took great interest in hearing about the creation of national parks abroad. In 1929 and 1930, the National Park Service was very excited about the establishment of Albert National Park in the Belgian Congo. Not only did the

[103] Ibid.
[104] Arno B. Cammerer, Acting Director, National Park Service, to Dr. John C. Merriam, President, Carnegie Institution of Washington, Washington D.C., May 3, 1929, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 629, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Miscellaneous, ca. 1914–32, NARA.
[105] Kupper, "Science and the National Parks," 59–67.
[106] "Italy's National Parks" by Ansel F. Hall, clipping from *American Forests & Forest Life*, April 1925, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 631, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Italy, 1920–44, NARA.

African park protect big game animals amid natural beauty, but its establishment was an important validation to the U.S. National Park Service of its work and of the global impact of the national park idea. King Albert had praised American national parks when establishing the Congo park. As a Department of the Interior memorandum noted:

> King Albert of Belgium recently paid high tribute to the national-park work of the United States, saying that it had inspired and set an example to all the world in the work of preserving the public domain for future generations. He dwelt at length on his visit to the United States when he visited several of the major national parks.[107]

"It was our Yellowstone park, by the way, which suggested the idea to King Albert," noted one of the numerous newspaper clippings on the matter collected by the National Park Service.[108] This was an early articulation of Yellowstone as the model for the worldwide national parks movement.

Around the same time, American park enthusiasts also expressed concern for the park situation in Greece and excitement that Mt. Olympus might be preserved as an American-style national park. In 1920, the American minister in Athens, Edward Capps, reported that there were "no national parks in Greece similar to those in the United States".[109] Even in 1932, still no progress had been made in developing a national park movement in Greece comparable to the one in the U.S.[110] However, for a brief period in the late 1920s, there was some discussion on whether Mt. Olympus should become a national park, which interestingly shows the articulation of the national park as an American idea. In 1929, *Science News-Letter* noted,

---

[107] Department of the Interior Memorandum for the Press, November 1929, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 629, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Belgian Congo, ca. 1930–32, NARA.

[108] "Congo Park," newspaper clipping from *Press Citizen* (Iowa City), 23 September 1929, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 629, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Belgian Congo, ca. 1930–32, NARA.

It is worth noting, though, that despite the influence of the U.S. on Albert National Park, the national park in Congo was actually quite different from American national parks since it emphasized scientific research, having been more influenced by the Swiss National Park model. See Raf De Bont, "A World Laboratory: Framing the Albert National Park," *Environmental History* 22 (2017): 404–432.

[109] Edward Capps, American Minister, to the Secretary of State, Washington, 6 October 1920, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 631, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Greece, 1920–35, NARA.

[110] [Illegible signature], to Mr. R. Wilbur, Secretary of the Interior, 16 March 1932, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 631, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Greece, 1920–35, NARA.

> Mount Olympus, majestic abode of the old Greek gods, may be turned into *a typical twentieth century institution, a national park*. Advocates of the national park idea in Greece are stressing both the esthetic and economic value to their nation in the creation of such a reservation. Since *the national park has become a typically American institution*, U. S. Park Service officials are pleased at the far-flung spread of a movement they foster.[111]

There were pieces on Mt. Olympus in several newspapers. Other observations by American magazines suggested that: "There is a movement under way in Greece, according to information received by the United States Department of the Interior, to convert Mount Olympus, the mythical home of the gods, into a national park modeled on those in this country."[112] Particularly interesting was the evaluation by newspapers of Greece's scenery in comparison to American mountains. One considered Mount Olympus and its surroundings "a wild and a largely uninhabited area comparable with such regions in America as the Great Smoky Mountains." Therefore, establishing the Greek park would make it possible to implement "the American wilderness area idea which is applied to certain national parks over here."[113] It is interesting the extent to which such writings applied American park standards to Greece. The suitability of an area to become a national park was confirmed by the fact that it fit the standards Americans held for their national parks: there had to be particular scenery—namely impressive and wild mountainous landscapes. These articles were based, sometimes almost word for word, on a Department of the Interior press release.[114] It is noteworthy that the park idea was referred to as having "become a typically American institution" and being "a typical twentieth century institution," one "foster[ed]" by the U.S. NPS, as

[111] "Olympus Urged for Greek Park," clipping from *Science News-Letter*, 24 August 1929, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 631, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Greece, 1920–35, NARA. Italics mine.
[112] "Mount Olympus May Become National Park," clipping from *Estes Park Trail* (Colorado), 3 May 1929, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 631, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Greece, 1920–35, NARA.
[113] "Olympus National Park," *The New Mexican* (Santa Fe, New Mexico), 8 April 1929, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 631, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Greece, 1920–35, NARA.
[114] Department of the Interior Press Release, 30 March 1929, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 631, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Greece, 1920–35, NARA.

if to make it an American idea. Judging from the correspondence retained by the National Park Service, there were some Americans in Greece who were urging the creation of the park, but no indication of a further movement. It is not quite clear whether the purpose of publishing these stories was to gather interest and support in the U.S. for national parks in Greece or to promote the national park as an American idea abroad. At this stage, the articulation of the park idea as an American idea was probably mainly connected to the interest of American park promoters in stressing the utility of creating national parks in the United States—international examples were helpful in this respect, as they highlighted the worth of national parks.

The National Park Service collected clippings on how the park idea was progressing, noticing especially news from abroad, even if many of the publicized cases did not even materialize. "A national park on the American plan is advocated by Lord Bledisloe, chairman of the Imperial Grassland Association, whose visits to the national parks of Canada and the United States have convinced him England should have at least one such playground," the *Washington Star* reported.[115] But why was the U.S. so pleased to hear of national parks in other countries—or even of very preliminary plans? Again, perhaps these details of other countries being interested in creating national parks were simply used as good examples to prove the general value of national parks in the United States, but they do provide early articulations of the promotion of the national park idea as an American idea.

There were also an increasing number of cases in which the United States was looked upon as the world leader in national park work or in which it was proclaimed a pioneer in the creation of national parks. In 1933, a German report noted that the United States, with the establishment of Yellowstone, "may well be considered to be the pioneer in Conservation," before introducing Hugo Conwentz and mentioning other European conservation measures. National park creation was almost a competition, as "since this spirit of conservation has been entering into and is being promoted in all cultivated countries, a lively competition has ensued as to who here accomplishes the most."[116] Other countries turned to the U.S. for advice on national

[115] "Plan U. S. Style Park," clipping from *Washington Star*, 3 September 1929, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 630, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, England, Pt. 1, 1916–30, NARA.
[116] "The Protection of Nature and the Promotion of cultural Policies concerning Conservation in Germany and in other countries," January 1933, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 630, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Germany, 1916–30, NARA.

parks. In its replies, the NPS mentioned that "The first national park, as such, was the Yellowstone, created by the Congress in 1872. It was at that time the national park idea was first advanced."[117] In 1921, the NPS supplied such information as copies of park legislation and annual reports to Mexico, with the hopes that the information would be useful in the recipient's work, "which we hope will result in the beginning of a national park system in Mexico."[118] In 1925, the National Park Service was happy to provide information about American national parks to Poland. As Stephen Mather noted, "It is always a pleasure to hear of some other nation becoming interested in the national park idea, and it is especially gratifying to know that our own work along these lines has been sufficiently successful to make others appeal to us for advice." Mather also mentioned the NPS's plans "in the near future to compile information regarding the national parks in all foreign countries."[119] Other nations, when asking for advice, suggested and validated that the national park idea was America's intellectual possession. The NPS now saw itself as having begun the national park movement and parks in other countries as having followed this lead. In 1933, Director Horace M. Albright noted:

> [N]ational parks are being established in many foreign countries, inspired by the national park system of the United States. The wonderful national parks of Canada and Australia are now well known, and even in recent years the establishment of such areas in Czechoslavakia [sic] and Poland, Congo and Argentine, show the extent to which this idea has hit other countries.[120]

[117] Arno B. Cammerer, Acting Director, National Park Service, to Mr. C. W. Hobley, Acting Secretary, Society for the Preservation of the Fauna of the Empire, London, England, 6 August 1927, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 630, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, England, Pt. 1, 1916–30, NARA.
[118] Arno B. Cammerer, Acting Director, to Prof. Juan Balme, Mexico City, 25 August 1921, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 631, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Mexico, 1921–27, NARA.
[119] Stephen T. Mather, Director, National Park Service, to Mr. Andrew F. Kowalski, Poland, 19 May 1925, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 631, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Poland, 1920–32, NARA.
[120] Horace M. Albright, Director, to Mr. Harry N. Burhans, San Diego, California, 10 January 1933, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2918, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, Mexico, 1933–47, NARA.

Americans, too, expected the National Park Service to be informed about foreign parks. For example, Mr. A. H. Ford, Secretary-Director of the Pan Pacific Union, wrote to the NPS in search of information about national parks in the countries of the Pacific for a publication.[121] Perhaps others were also important in suggesting to the National Park Service that the park idea was foremost an American idea. In 1932, the National Park Service received a query for information about foreign national parks from Herbert Maier. He was writing on the business of the American Association of Museums as he was to prepare "a world map showing 'The Spread of the National Park Idea,'" one that would show "the names and location of national parks thruout [sic] the world as they followed the establishment of Yellowstone Park in 1872." Maier had been told that the National Park Service was "the most likely source of this data." After all, it was "necessary" for him "to have information on all the national parks of the world."[122] Maier received some reports that the NPS had collected on foreign parks.[123] It is interesting that already at this stage it was suggested that the park idea was something that had spread from the U.S. to other countries and that the NPS was the likely possessor of information about foreign parks. The National Park Service, however, did not stress this American invention of national parks too heavily in its correspondence just yet.

Notably, many Americans—such as officials in associations engaged in international conservation work—asked the NPS for wide-ranging information about foreign parks. John C. Phillips, Chairman for the American Game Association, wrote to Director Cammerer in 1935 on behalf of the American Committee for International Wild Life Protection. He had learned that the NPS had started "a study of the national parks of the world" and "wanted to say that our American Committee is tremendously interested in seeing such a compilation finished, for it would help enormously in our

[121] A. H. Ford, Secretary-Director, Pan Pacific Union, to Hon. Stephen T. Mather, National Parks Bureau, 28 July 1921, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 629, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Miscellaneous, ca. 1914–32, NARA.

[122] Herbert Maier to Director, National Park Service, Washington D.C., Aug. 21, 1932, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 629, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Miscellaneous, ca. 1914–32, NARA.

[123] H. C. Bryant, Assistant Director, National Park Service, to Herbert Maier, Dec 22 1932, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 629, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Miscellaneous, ca. 1914–32, NARA.

work in foreign countries."[124] In 1934, Miss Betty Eckhardt, Executive Secretary of Oglebay Institute in Oglebay Park, West Virginia, wrote to the NPS to ask for information on national parks in other countries. Unfortunately, the NPS did "not have anything for distribution on this subject," but Isabelle F. Story did loan Miss Eckhardt some foreign materials from the NPS's official files.[125]

As noted in the previous sub-chapter, Canada was a kind of special case for the U.S. since it had developed similar parks from early on, and the two North American nations could benefit from each other's experiences. Japan, on the other hand, was a distinct but more curious case in American park co-operation. Park developments in Japan seemed to receive special interest from the National Park Service. American park officials were impressed by Japanese efforts and happy to co-operate and offer advice. They constantly re-emphasized that the U.S. National Park Service was more than happy to hear about Japanese parks and to help Japanese park planners. In 1924, Arno B. Cammerer replied to a letter from Dr. Tsuyoshi Tamura, making special note of American interest in Japanese national park development: "I hope that it will not be too much trouble for you to write us from time to time as we are deeply interested in what you are doing."[126] Potential Japanese national parks could be used as an incentive for developing the American parks. In the summer of 1923, Thomas Boles, the Superintendent of Hawaii National Park, wrote to the Director of the NPS. He provided copies of some newspaper clippings, which suggested that the American park idea was popular in Japan and that there were plans to establish seven national parks in the country, "to be patterned after the American National Parks." His main point, however, was that for this reason, Hawaii National Park should be developed to be "one of the best, for this park is the one most of them will see." Boles went on to note that "about ten percent of our visitors are Japanese."[127]

---

[124] John C. Phillips, Chairman for the American Game Association, to Mr. Arno B. Cammerer, Director of National Park Service, 2 August 1935, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2913, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, 1933–48, NARA.

[125] Isabelle F. Story, Editor-in-Chief, to Miss Betty Eckhardt, Executive Secretary, Oglebay Institute, Oglebay Park, Wheeling, West Virginia, 12 September 1934, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2913, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, 1933–48, NARA.

[126] Arno B. Cammerer, Acting Director, to Dr. Tsuyoshi Tamura, 14 November 1924, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 631, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Japan, 1911–32, NARA.

[127] Thomas Boles, Superintendent, Hawaii National Park, to Director, National Park Service, 31 July 1923, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 631, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Japan, 1911–32, NARA.

Japan was very interested in learning from the U.S. when it came to national parks. American achievements in setting up national parks "constitute a powerful stimulus to us in our aspiring campaign to build up ideal national parks in Japan," noted one Japanese park official.[128] An article by Japanese Professor Go Tamura of Tokyo Imperial University (identified in the article as a "World Famous Authority on Forestry Problems") noted in its lead that "Choosing From Among Hundreds of Scenic Attractions, the Authorities And Prominent People Are Now Planning to Found A Recreation Ground Worthy of the Name of National Park."[129] As can be seen here, "national park" as a label and brand seemed to have some name recognition already and, influenced by American park ideals, it was understood as a recreational area. The article went on to note that Japanese leaders planning national parks "consider the examples of the United States and Canada worth imitating."[130] Japanese scenery was compared to that of the United States. One suitable area for a park, Nikko, was considered thoroughly splendid, even better than American park landscapes, as "Unlike the Yellowstone Park which contains places that are dull and monotonous, every foot of the ground one treads in Nikko presents to him a fresh charm…"[131] One Japanese landscape, on the other hand, had a view that "reminds one of Mammoth Hot Spring in Yellowstone Park."[132]

The National Park Service received information that there was great enthusiasm for national park work in Japan from a man who was in the process of writing a book about American national parks. Acting Director A. E. Demaray was of the opinion that information about parks in the U.S. "should stimulate the interest of your countrymen in the development of Japanese National Parks." He also promised the Service's help in furnishing pictures for the publication and sent him a copy of the *National Parks Portfolio*.[133] The Japanese man in question, Yoshio Aoki, was a Stanford graduate who described himself as "a very earnest student of nature and a lover

[128] J. Takaku, Director, National Park Association of Japan, to National Park Service, 14 April 1930, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 631, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Japan, 1911–32, NARA.
[129] "A National Park in the Making," by Go Tamura, clipping from *Japan Today and Tomorrow*, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 631, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Japan, 1911–32, NARA.
[130] Ibid.
[131] Ibid.
[132] Ibid.
[133] A. E. Demaray, Acting Director, to Mr. Yoshio Aoki, 26 September 1929, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 631, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Japan, 1911–32, NARA.

of the American scenery." His letter to the U.S. National Park Service noted the enthusiasm there was in Japan for the national park movement and mentioned to the American park authorities that their example was useful: "Dr. S. Honda, Dr. K. Uehara and Dr. T. Tamura have already been there to study your National Parks." Mr. Aoki's motivation for writing his book, titled "A study of the American National Parks," was to offer the Japanese public a chance to learn about American conservation thought (for example, John Muir's thoughts). At present, Mr. Aoki noted, Japanese people were only interested in "climbing mountain as to conquest nature." He was hoping to promote an understanding of nature and the meaning of national parks in his own country.[134] It is noteworthy that already in 1929, the U.S. was seen as a model for nature conservation and park philosophy was understood at a profound level. Japanese officials were looking to the U.S. and Europe also for other reasons, for example to learn about their practices so as to ensure that the facilities at Unzen Prefectural Park met the same standards.[135]

Publications such as *The National Parks Portfolio* and *Glimpses of Our National Parks* were sent to Japan as well as copies of annual reports and other regulations and rules.[136] There was much interest in American national parks among the Japanese people. Dr. Keiji Uyehara, who was—among other things—President of the Japanese Landscape Architectural Society and Park Commissioner of Tokyo and Yokohama, wrote to the National Park Service to ask if the Japanese Landscape Architectural Society could establish an office called the "Information Bureau of U.S. National Park Service" to reply to the strong Japanese demand for information about American parks. Dr. Uyehara wrote that "such interest for national parks is now promoting among our people, by being introduced your parks."[137] While the American park authorities were delighted that the Japanese took such an interest in American

[134] Yoshio Aoki to Mr. Stephen Mather, 25 August 1929, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 631, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Japan, 1911–32, NARA.
[135] Henry B. Hitchcock, American Consul, Nagasaki, Japan, to the Secretary of State, Washington, 26 November 1928, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 631, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Japan, 1911–32, NARA.
[136] Stephen T. Mather, Director, National Park Service, to Mr. Manabu Miyoshi, Honorary Professor of Imperial University of Tokyo, 30 August 1927; Stephen T. Mather, Director, National Park Service, to Dr. Keiji Uyehara, Tokyo, 24 June 1927, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 631, File: 0-30 Foreign Parks, Japan, 1911–32, NARA.
[137] Dr. Keiji Uyehara, President of the Japanese Landscape Architectural Society, to Mr. Stephen T. Mather, 1 June 1927, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 631, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Japan, 1911–32, NARA.

national parks and in promoting them in Japan, and were more than happy to supply materials, Stephen T. Mather suggested a slight change to the title: "Information bureau regarding the U. S. National Parks," as the National Park Service had "no authority to establish a branch office, even without any expense attached, in a foreign country…"[138] Dr. Keiji Uyehara even offered insights in a talk titled "Nature Preservation and National Park Problems in Japan" at the Pan Pacific Conference in April 1927. It demonstrated his deep knowledge about park systems around the world and also recognized the American influence, Dr. Uyehara mentioning his visit to study park systems in 1920 and 1921. His talk also noted that "The real meaning of the term 'National Park' is interpreted differently in every country." Japan did not yet have national parks, but as Dr. Uyehara noted, a parks system "may be brought about, we trust, by concerted action, the cordial help of government efforts, favorable public sentiment, and the aid of the United States of America, 'pioneer of the park movement' as Mr. John J. Tigert has said."[139]

Japanese efforts paid off, and their hard work was noted in the U.S. In 1932, Arno B. Cammerer was happy to receive publications of Japanese national parks and commended the country for its excellent work in national park creation:

> According to the articles and photographs, Japan has made tremendous strides in the establishment of national parks. We have been particularly interested in this project, because during the past ten years so many representatives of your country interested in national parks visited the national parks of our country, and we have been privileged in helping them to the best advantage.[140]

---

[138] Stephen T. Mather, Director, National Park Service, to Dr. Keiji Uyehara, Tokyo, 24 June 1927, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 631, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Japan, 1911–32, NARA.

[139] "Nature Preservation and National Park Problems in Japan" by Dr. Keiji Uyehara, Delegate from Japan and President of the Japanese Landscape Architectural Society, Pan Pacific Conference, Honolulu, T. H., 10 April 1927, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 631, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Japan, 1911–32, NARA.

[140] Arno B. Cammerer, Acting Director, National Park Service, to Dr. T. Tamura, National Park Association of Japan, 30 December 1932, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 631, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Japan, 1911–32, NARA.

Clearly, then, the partial responsibility that the NPS felt for Japan's success increased American interest in the country's parks. These did not seem like just polite words to a foreign colleague; instead, Cammerer seemed genuinely impressed by Japan's scenery and national park work. He told Horace Albright that the Japanese materials were "Of absorbing interest, and value for our records." Japanese scenery, as shown in the pictures, was "amazingly beautiful and impressive."[141] Japan relied on the U.S. for help. T. Tamura, the leading park person in Japan, wrote to Director Cammerer in 1933 to ask that copies of American park publications be sent to him in the future, too. He mentioned his belief that the national parks movement in Japan would grow, but "we shall need the assistance of your Service greatly, and it is my earnest hope that you will favour us with such assistance as ever."[142] In 1937, Director Cammerer noted that many Japanese officials had been to the U.S. to study the parks, which had directly resulted in park creation in Japan.[143] This might well have been an attempt to argue for the importance of the work that the NPS was doing and position the national park idea as an American invention.

"Our Service being the pioneer of the National Park idea for the world should feel its responsibility in fostering and vitalizing this movement which has already been taken up by so many other countries," suggested NPS landscape architect Merel S. Sager to the Director, noting that Japan had created many national parks in the 1930s. According to Sager, Dr. Tamura had expressed interest in hosting an international national park conference in Japan in 1940, and Sager urged the NPS to consider supporting this initiative.[144] Other NPS employees urged the Director to appreciate Japanese parks, too. The Superintendent of Yosemite National Park forwarded the Director a pamphlet of a proposed national park in Japan ("'The Grand Canyon of Taroko'") that he had received from a Japanese visitor to Yosemite. The Superintendent noted:

---

[141] Arno B. Cammerer memorandum for Mr. Albright, 30 December 1932, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 631, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Japan, 1911–32, NARA.
[142] T. Tamura, National Park Association of Japan, to Mr. Arno B. Cammerer, National Park Service, 3 February 1933, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2917, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, Japan, 1933–49, NARA.
[143] Arno B. Cammerer memorandum for Secretary Ickes, 15 March 1937, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2917, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, Japan, 1933–49, NARA.
[144] Merel S. Sager, Associate Landscape Architect, to Director, National Park Service, 23 December 1936, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2917, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, Japan, 1933–49, NARA.

> As you doubtless know, the interest of the Japanese in the creation of National Parks is enormous. Unquestionably, as a people their capacity for the appreciation of beauty surpasses that of any other people, and of course they are fully alive to the financial advantages that may accrue.[145]

It is interesting that the Japanese people were in this way singled out as being particularly appreciative of nature.

Since the early 1920s, the National Park Service had collected information through diplomatic channels. From 1936 to 1940, there was a break in this activity, but again in 1940 the Secretary of the Interior expressed the hope that American diplomats would be instructed to collect information about national parks in their respective countries.[146] By the mid-1930s, the NPS had an organized collection of files on national parks in foreign countries.[147] However, as Herbert Maier, a Service employee who had been collecting foreign park material, noted with respect to acquiring information on foreign parks: "We do not have sufficient time to pursue this task and to keep it up to date."[148] Maier had been working on a compilation on foreign national parks until his present duty at the NPS had compelled him to discontinue it in May 1933. In his work on the project, he had got to "the point where practically all of the material from all of the foreign countries had been assembled through the canvass of foreign representatives by the Department of State in Washington." However, even though he had begun compiling the material, it still needed to be translated and gone through to obtain the most useful information for a report.[149]

---

[145] [Illegible signature], Superintendent, Yosemite National Park, to Director, National Park Service, 3 December 1933, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2917, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, Japan, 1933–49, NARA.

[146] E. K. Burlew, Acting Secretary of the Interior, to the Secretary of State, 22 April 1940, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2913, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, 1933–48, NARA.

[147] Herbert Maier, Acting Regional Director, to the Director, National Park Service, Subject: Files on National Parks in Foreign Countries, 21 August 1937, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2913, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, 1933–48, NARA.

[148] Herbert Maier, Regional Officer, to the Director, National Park Service, Subject: National Parks in Foreign Countries, 3 June 1937, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2913, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, 1933–48, NARA.

[149] Herbert Maier, Regional Officer, to Mr. John D. Phillips, International Wildlife Protection, 28 July 1935, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2913, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, 1933–48, NARA.

There were plans for a more comprehensive compilation of foreign parks material in the mid-1930s. Arno B. Cammerer noted:

> Even though the National Park Idea had its inception in this country and has since spread all over the world, the rapid change and growth in complexity of our social and economic system within the last half century have had such impact upon the national parks, monuments, and nature reservations that a study and orientation, such as we discussed, are vitally needed at this time.[150]

The lack of funds prevented the work, even if the NPS repeatedly argued for its importance. Isabelle F. Story noted that the NPS "now has two drawers of foreign park material in its files, much of it out-of-date." Some Service employees had been working on foreign park materials, but receiving funding for a project to compile the information about foreign parks would be important, as "Such a report would be extremely useful to the Service and would also enable us to answer more adequately many requests received for foreign park data."[151] Quite simply—the NPS was expected to know about foreign parks as, for some reason, Americans turned to the NPS to ask about parks in other countries. Perhaps it is a telling example of how the park idea was beginning to be created as an American idea: Americans contacted the NPS as if the national park idea was an American monopoly and the National Park Service would follow all national park developments abroad (as if they were just offsets of an American idea).

However, such a project of comprehensively assembling material did not happen, even if there was a great deal of discussion concerning the practical arrangements for it. "I feel strongly that anyone who attempts this work should be familiar with our own park system and capable of distinguishing between the different types of foreign areas which go under the name of 'park', but which are perhaps not comparable with our national parks," Assistant Director H. C. Bryant noted. He estimated that "much of the work will need to be done in the Library of Congress and

[150] Arno B. Cammerer, Director, to Dr. John C. Phillips, 17 February 1936, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2913, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, 1933–48, NARA.
[151] Isabelle F. Story, Editor-in-Chief, memorandum for the Director, 29 November 1935, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2913, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, 1933–48, NARA.

that a reading knowledge of French and German would be helpful."[152] There was some discussion on who would be suitable for doing such work.[153] In any case, Bryant felt that the need for this work "is very great and it might be that we shall have to do it in a less professional way than it should be done."[154] Bryant was adamant about the importance of the project: "The survey of Foreign National Parks which should be made to put the Park Service in a position to answer inquiries coming to it concerning such areas is one requiring considerable research at the Library of Congress and is not a statistical matter." It is interesting that he stressed that the compiler of the material needed to be able to distinguish between national parks and "foreign areas which go under various names, but are not true parks."[155] Clearly, then, the national park idea was something distinct and not all foreign parks measured up. It was also obvious that the NPS would be receiving inquiries and needed to be prepared.

In 1936, Director Cammerer proposed a WPA project to translate and study foreign park material that the NPS had collected as well as to classify and compile a thorough report on the material. Cammerer noted that funding such a project "will enable the Service to assemble very valuable information on the various park systems of the world."[156] The National Park Service had during these years hoped to be able to do more collecting work on foreign parks, but not much progress had been made, apparently due to a lack of funds. Isabelle F. Story noted in 1939:

> For many years we have been endeavoring to get more information about foreign parks and for two years we have endeavored, without success, to get a WPA project. A few years ago Herb Maier did some research on the

[152] H. C. Bryant, Assistant Director, memorandum for Mr. Tolson, 21 April 1936, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2913, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, 1933–48, NARA.
[153] Hillory A. Tolson, Acting Associate Director, memorandum for Mr. Bryant, 8 May 1936; Bryant memorandum for Tolson, 5 May 1936; Tolson memorandum for Bryant, 29 April 1936; RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2913, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, 1933–48, NARA.
[154] H. C. Bryant, Assistant Director, memorandum for Mr. Tolson, 21 April 1936, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2913, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, 1933–48, NARA.
[155] H. C. Bryant, Assistant Director, memorandum for Mr. Tolson, 25 February 1936, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2913, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, 1933–48, NARA.
[156] Arno B. Cammerer, Director, memorandum for the Secretary, 26[?] June 1936, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2913, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, 1933–48, NARA.

> subject. Previous to that we had several times polled the foreign embassies for information on parks in their countries.[157]

She continued that "In view of our keen interest in the matter I think we should keep all this material and should continue our endeavor to secure a project to really work up a foreign parks study."[158] In 1944, the National Park Service no longer kept records on foreign national parks. While materials had originally been collected through embassies and legations, later there had been other projects to compile information about foreign parks. As materials kept coming to the NPS, they were referred to one person. This was Isabelle F. Story's—who was the Editor in Chief at the NPS Office of Information—reply to a memorandum asking for information about foreign national parks and "any statement as to how the 'national park idea' spread to other countries after Yellowstone?"[159] All in all, the National Park Service's efforts and practices in collecting information about national parks abroad seemed rather haphazard and not always so systematic or well-organized. It seems that whereas in the 1920s the NPS was quite interested in this international work and set out to find as much as it could about national parks abroad, by the 1940s that interest had waned, perhaps simply because the amount of work was immense and funding quite limited. In any case, it is clear that before the Second Word War, the NPS entertained hopes and plans to more comprehensively collect material from foreign parks. Perhaps this was considered important also because of the budding idea in the U.S. as well as abroad that the park idea was an American invention that had spread from the U.S. to other countries.

No doubt the NPS was interested in foreign parks in their own right and wanted to learn from them. But others also expected it to possess this information, which clearly served as motivation and an argument for compiling information about foreign parks. It seems as if the fact that the NPS received queries about national parks in other countries and that others suggested to the NPS that the park idea was an American invention contributed to the NPS's own growing articulation that this was

---

[157] I[sabelle] F. S[tory], Editor-in-Chief, memorandum for Dr. Russell, 5 September 1939, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2913, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, 1933–48, NARA.
[158] Ibid.
[159] Isabelle F. Story, Editor in Chief, [NPS Office of Information], memorandum for Mr. Tolson, 19 August 1944; Tolson memorandum to Miss Story 15 August 1944, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2913, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, 1933–48, NARA.

indeed the case. It appears that in the 1920s, the NPS set out to ascertain whether other countries had parks similar to American national parks, perhaps out of sheer curiosity or a desire to learn from them, but in this process and indeed since then, the national park idea became heavily articulated as an American invention.

Some countries seemed to acknowledge the national park idea as an American invention in the late 1930s and the 1940s. The Australian Minister for Lands Percy Pease discussed American park policy in an article, "so that we can draw some comparisons with our own." Australia was developing a national park policy, and Pease asked "What is the national park ideal?" Interestingly, he noted: "If we trace the history of the national park movement in the United States back to its sources we find that in 1870 one man, Cornelius Hedges, set alight the fire of national park idealism, which has burned brightly ever since." He continued that Hedges's "view caught the national imagination, was taken up, and the result of his selfless ideal has been of inestimable benefit to the people not only of America, but of the world."[160] It is notable that Pease seemed to view the national park idea as something universal, with national parks not being independent creations by nations themselves, but part of a coherent movement that had originated in the United States. He also saw the national park idea as having been created during this moment and not as a flexible and fluid, constantly developing, concept.

The United States and its national parks offered a good starting point for any country—be it Norway or Morocco—that contemplated the creation of national parks. For example, one Norwegian sent a letter to the NPS requesting copies of American park laws and other materials as Norway was on the brink of establishing its first national park, which he worded as follows:

> Judging from what I have seen of the world's National Parks, I think that the American system ranks a good number 1. America gave the world the idea and I firmly believe that the rest of the world may safely follow her

[160] "American Parks Policy – No. 3 – By P. Pease, Minister for Lands (From the Brisbane, Australia 'Telegraph,' June 26, 1937)," RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2914, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, Australia, 1933–48, Pt. 1, Jan 1933–Sep 1942, NARA.

example respecting the laws governing the parks as well as their administration.[161]

In another instance, Mr. Delrieu from Morocco was formulating a plan for a national park in his country and turned to the NPS for help. He wished to obtain information and materials on American parks because of "the world-wide fame of which makes them models from which I should like to draw as much inspiration as possible."[162]

"Europe Lacks National Parks," cried a headline in a short *Oakland Tribune* article from July 1929, apparently completely forgetting about national parks in countries such as Sweden and Switzerland. "Sadly lacking in Europe, due to the overcrowded conditions of the continent and the centuries of exploitation of natural resources, the national park idea in the United States is an innovation of foresight of a great and contented people," was "the aggregate opinion of a party of eleven outstanding European journalists" who had visited a few U.S. national parks on a Carnegie Foundation trip. The purpose of the trip financed by the Carnegie Foundation was "seeing and understanding the United States and its people, in order that the exorbitant ideas prevalent in Europe today may be corrected."[163] This is one of the first cases in which the national park idea was quite blatantly argued as a way to showcase the more positive aspects of Americans and the true character of the nation. This kind of articulation would become even more prominent during the Cold War, when national parks were often promoted as a positive showcase of American culture and way of life.

In January 1945, the Department of State inquired as to whether the National Park Service had 100 copies of the publications *Glimpses of Historical Areas East of the Mississippi River* and *Glimpses of Our National Parks*, in addition to a list of other available publications, to be send to Mexico. The publications that the Secretary of State sought "would promote a better knowledge of the United States, its institutions and ideology in this farflung primitive region where the influence has been

[161] Frits W. Petterson, Naturalist, Oslo, Norway, to Mr. Arno B. Cammerer, Director, National Park Service, 23[?] January 1939, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2919, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, Norway, 1920–39, NARA.
[162] M. Rene Delrieu, Engineer, Chief of the Rural Engineering of the Arrondissement, Fez, to the Director of the National Park Service, 20 November 1944, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2919, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, Morocco, 1927–45, NARA.
[163] "Europe Lacks National Parks," clipping from *Oakland Tribune* (California), 21 July 1929, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 631, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, New Zealand, 1916–32, NARA.

predominantly Japanese, Spanish and other European and Asiatic…"[164] This idea—that the national park idea could be used to give a better or more accurate image of the United States abroad—would prove to be even more prevalent during the Cold War years of ideological struggle, when the national park was crafted as a positive, great American idea.

[164] [The Secretary of State to the Secretary of the Interior], Department of State, Washington, 8 January 1945, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2918, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, Mexico, 1933–47, NARA.

Chapter 2

The Politics of Nature: Post-war National Park Co-operation and the Making of the Americanness of the National Park Idea

This chapter examines how the national park idea began to be heavily marketed as an American idea during the Cold War and how this showed in international national park co-operation. I do not focus on the Cold War as such here—what is central is that the national park idea was constructed and affirmed as an American idea during this time. This chapter argues that the fact that the national park idea was marketed as an American idea during Cold War strengthened its Americanness.

After the Second World War, the national park idea as an American idea quickly gained more ground and new meanings. The national park idea can also be seen as part of the U.S. cultural diplomacy and modernization agenda abroad. The national park idea was connected to advancing the democratic progress of nations and heavily promoted as an American invention internationally. Co-operation with Japan is a great example of this, as national parks were seen to play a role in the development of Japanese society after the war.

International conservation meetings provided a platform for articulating and promoting the American origin of the park idea. During the Cold War years, several developments in international park co-operation—including the creation of the Division of International Affairs within the National Park Service in 1961 and the organization of the First World Conference on National Parks in 1962—strengthened the idea of the national park idea as an American idea. The World Conferences on National Parks, conservation programs abroad, as well as international seminars on park management organized in the United States also contributed to viewing the United States as the birthplace of national parks. Various foundations were important in financing international park co-operation, and they contributed to the export of American park practices in this way.

Finally, this chapter addresses the African student program as an example of how the national park idea was used to promote American culture and values. The

National Park Service has not traditionally advertised national parks to African Americans or Latinos. National parks have been very white places. However, as I will show, national parks were marketed to African students. This is very significant, as it shows that even though African Americans were not the targeted audience of American national parks, the national park idea was such a useful export that it was still marketed to African students to give them a deeper and more favorable image of the United States and inspire them to promote the park idea in their home countries.

This chapter draws the conclusion that the view of the national park idea as a great American invention was a construction related to many other issues of the time and that the Cold War ideological atmosphere strengthened and affirmed the Americanness of the national park idea. National parks were not only related to nature conservation; the park idea was also a useful cultural export. In this sense, the national park idea and the Cold War cultural diplomacy and modernization agenda were closely linked. One could even think of the national park idea as part of the American development and modernization agenda abroad—a cultural export comparable to Coca Cola.

2.1. A New World Order and the National Park Idea

The United States emerged from the Second World War as a superpower. The establishment of NATO and American initiatives such as the Marshall Plan tied European nations more closely to the United States after the war. The United States sought to contain the spread of communism also through public and cultural diplomacy. The United States Information Agency (USIA), created in the 1950s, was important in expanding the influence of American culture. Cultural centers and exchange programs promoted the American way of life and the American democratic tradition abroad. American global leadership was also consolidated with the export of American popular culture, ranging from Hollywood movies and rock music to fast food.[165] Ecological

[165] For a brief overview, see Alexander Stephan, "Cold War Alliances and the Emergence of Transatlantic Competition: An Introduction," in *The Americanization of Europe: Culture, Diplomacy, and Anti-Americanism after 1945*, ed. Alexander Stephan (New York & Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2006), 1–20. See also Andrew J. Falk, *Upstaging the Cold War: American Dissent and Cultural Diplomacy, 1940–1960* (Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2011); Greg Barnhisel, *Cold War Modernists: Art, Literature, and American Cultural Diplomacy, 1946–1959* (New York: Columbia

science, too, can be seen as an American export during the Cold War years. For example, American conservation ecology has greatly influenced ideals and practices in India, as the connections and co-operation between the two countries have shaped the development of the Indian science of ecology.[166] This chapter argues that the national park idea was connected to the U.S. Cold War cultural diplomacy and modernization agenda and that promoting the national park idea as an American idea during the Cold War strengthened its Americanness.

Kenneth Osgood argues that "most Americans did not identify the Cold War primarily as a military confrontation" but, for example, as "a war of ideas" or "a war of propaganda." He also notes that this propaganda or psychological warfare was present both at home and abroad, as the government sought to sway American public opinion as well as win the hearts and minds of foreign peoples.[167]

Modernization efforts were important in American Cold War policy in an attempt to contain communism and Soviet influence and to promote democracy and American ideology in the Third World countries, as it was thought that only with American aid could these "underdeveloped" countries achieve historical progress. The use of development and foreign aid as tools in the Cold War ideological battle were sparked by President Harry Truman's "Point Four" speech in 1949. Along with U.S. government agencies, philanthropic foundations like the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation participated in international development work and played an important role in modernization efforts, for example in agricultural development projects in developing countries.[168] As David Ekbladh notes, the U.S. government saw "technologically primed development as a means to promote politically acceptable

---

University Press, 2015); Richard T. Arndt, *The First Resort of Kings: American Cultural Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century* (Dulles, VA: Potomac Books, 2005).

[166] Michael L. Lewis, *Inventing Global Ecology: Tracking the Biodiversity Ideal in India, 1947–1997* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2004).

[167] Kenneth Osgood, *Total Cold War: Eisenhower's Secret Propaganda Battle at Home and Abroad* (Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2006), quote from p. 1.

[168] David Ekbladh, *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2010). See also Nick Cullather, *The Hungry World: America's Cold War Battle Against Poverty in Asia* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010); Michael E. Latham, *The Right Kind of Revolution: Modernization, Development, and U.S. Foreign Policy From the Cold War to the Present* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011); Michael E. Latham, *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and "Nation Building" in the Kennedy Era* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007); Michael Adas, *Dominance by Design: Technological Imperatives and America's Civilizing Mission* (Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006); Michael H. Hunt, *American Ascendancy: How the United States Gained and Wielded Global Dominance* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007).

social and economic change in a divided globe."[169] He sums up the role of modernization efforts during Cold War ideological struggles as follows: "Both sides sought transformation in the new states as a way to demonstrate that their ideologies were best suited to deliver the benefits of modern life." He continues: "Modernization is deeply implicated in what has more aptly been described as the establishment of American global hegemony. The project that modernization served in the twentieth century was not always humanitarian but strategic."[170] Environmental matters played a role in the Cold War rivalry, too. In contrast to the heavy environmental burden of the Cold War, there is a more positive aspect. Stephen Brain has noted how the competition between the U.S. and the Soviet Union positively impacted international environmental agreements, as it was useful for the superpowers to "appear green."[171]

As my study shows, constructing and affirming the Americanness of the national park idea was connected to and strengthened by the larger American Cold War project of propaganda and modernization. In many ways, national parks were part of cultural diplomacy—in a way the national park idea was an American trademark like Coca Cola.

National parks were seen as great forms of cultural exchange. For example, American information centers could work to promote national parks. In 1961, the Director of the U.S. Information Center Amerika Haus in Kaiserslautern, Germany, wrote to the Department of Interior with some ideas. He had been giving lectures on national parks but needed some more information on them. The Director, Thomas J. Mulvehill, also hoped to obtain "slides showing visitors enjoying the various attractions of the different parks." He mentioned trying to advertise trips to American national parks and suggested that the Department of Interior might tailor special options for European travelers.[172] Mulvehill wrote:

---

[169] Ekbladh, *Great American Mission*, 79.
[170] Ibid., 2.
[171] Stephen Brain, "The Appeal of Appearing Green: Soviet-American Ideological Competition and Cold War Environmental Diplomacy," *Cold War History* 16, 4 (2016): 443–462.
[172] Thomas J. Mulvehill, Director, U.S. Information Center, Amerika Haus, Kaiserslautern, Germany, to Director of Information, United States Department of Interior, Washington, D.C., 15 June 1961, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2170, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Cooperation with Foreign Agencies, 1958–63, NARA. Stephan, "Cold War Alliances," 9, notes that "So-called *Amerikahäuser* transported selected U.S. high culture across the Atlantic, until the German 'economic miracle' at the end of the 1950s brought Germans enough extra buying power to afford the products of popular culture …".

> Could your agency, perhaps in concert with the Department of Commerce come up with a packaged "National Parks Tour" for foreign visitors at a special "cultural exchange" sort of rate, perhaps done with chartered planes and buses, and reserving a reasonable number of cabins etc. in the parks at "European rates" for the visitors.[173]

National parks were also an important consideration globally after the Second World War from a geopolitical standpoint.[174] For Japan, the end of the Second World War meant the beginning of the occupation and reconstruction of the country under the Allied Powers—most notably the United States—led by General Douglas A. MacArthur. Japan was disarmed and democratized, its educational system reformed, and its economy developed and closely connected to that of the United States. In this process, American policies and ideals transformed many core components of Japanese society.[175] It is worth noting how national parks, too, seemed to play a role in reforming Japanese society and making Japan a more democratic nation.

Before the war, U.S. National Park Service officials had actively corresponded with their Japanese colleagues. After the war, American interest in park development in Japan continued—despite the strain the war had put on relations between the two countries, or perhaps because of it. National parks were even seen to play a role in Japan's post-war development towards democracy. In 1946, the National Park Service received a request for help from Captain Walter D. Popham regarding the national park situation in Japan. He wrote, "In my work with the Arts and Monuments Division, CI&E Section of GHQ, I frequently have occasion to work with and advise the Japanese National Park Service." He explained that "Our principal task just now is to try and prevent damage to Park areas, and at times this reaches rather formidable proportions," noting the fear of the Japanese people about losing their resources as well

[173] Ibid.
[174] For example, there were plans for a world park in Antarctica in the early 1960s (which, however, did not materialize) with U.S. interest and involvement in planning. See Mark Fiege, Adrian Howkins, and Jared Orsi, "Beyond the Best Idea: A Look at Mount Rainier, Antarctica, and the Sonoran Desert," in *National Parks Beyond the Nation: Global Perspectives on "America's Best Idea"*, ed. Adrian Howkins, Jared Orsi, and Mark Fiege (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2016), 14–48.
[175] Richard J. Barnet, *The Alliance—America, Europe, Japan: Makers of the Postwar World* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983), 59–94. See also Andrew Gordon (ed.), *Postwar Japan as History* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993). For more on Japanese park history, see Thomas R. H. Haves, *Parkscapes: Green Spaces in Modern Japan* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2011).

as the plans for hydro-electric and irrigation projects that threatened park areas. Popham was hopeful, however, that it would not be possible to undertake such projects for a while, "so we may be able to delay such works until public sentiment can be aroused." He was hoping to secure an American park professional to come to Japan to work on national park matters as a consultant, for example someone from the National Park Service. Pending that outcome, Popham turned to the park agency to obtain any information that would be useful in national park planning in Japan and for the future development of parks, such as master plans or information about park buildings. He noted that "we will appreciate anything which you might do to strengthen the case of preserving areas already set aside for National Parks." It was important to convey the importance of this work as part of rebuilding Japan.[176] Popham further wrote:

> The present park service of Japan has taken quite a beating during and since the war, and we have been trying to bolster them up a bit, and would appreciate if you could give us a slight boost by memorializing the War Department to try and protect park and Scenic Values as a necessary part of rebuilding Japan.[177]

Director Newton B. Drury replied to him with assurances that the NPS "would like to help you in every way that it can." Director Drury mentioned that Popham would be receiving publications and reports on parks but that the NPS might not be able to provide a staff member to assist in Japanese park problems. He did mention, however, that a draft letter had been prepared, to be sent from the Secretary of the Interior to the Secretary of War, "commending the War Department on the part it is playing in trying to protect the national parks and areas of scenic significance in Japan." The National Park Service also wished to receive any available materials on national parks in Japan.[178]

---

[176] Walter D. Popham, AUS, Captain, Field Inspector, CI&E Section – GHQ – SCAP, to Newton B. Drury, Director, National Park Service, 27 December 1946, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2917, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, Japan, 1933–49, NARA.
[177] Ibid.
[178] Newton B. Drury, Director, National Park Service, to Walter D. Popham, AUS, Captain, Field Inspector, CI&E Section – GHQ – SCAP, 20 February 1947, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2917, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, Japan, 1933–49, NARA.

Indeed, the War Department received a letter from the Department of the Interior commending the "far-sighted" work of the occupying forces on park matters in Japan. The letter is particularly interesting because it articulates the significance and meanings of national parks. Notably, it was mentioned twice that national parks and democracy had a close connection. This connection was seen in the past of the U.S. and its national parks:

> The history of the United States is evidence that the preservation of our great scenic spectacles and our outstanding scientific and historic features, and their use and enjoyment by the people, are among the things that made our Nation great and are closely associated with the democratic way of life.[179]

Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman's letter ended with the assessment that "park and recreational facilities in Japan will need to be greatly expanded if they are to be a moving force in siding the Japanese *to become a more democratic people*."[180] The national park idea, then, was argued to be directly related to the development of democracy in Japan.

In early 1948, the army asked for help from the National Park Service for national park work in Japan, following "a request from General MacArthur's headquarters in Tokyo for the services of a consultant on national parks to serve in Japan for a period of three months this spring or summer." The consultant would work with the occupation forces and Japanese park officials to develop the national parks system in Japan. The Department of the Army was looking for a qualified person "with considerable experience in the national park system of the United States and some knowledge of the systems of Europe." Expenses for this assignment were to be paid by the army department.[181] Charles Richey, one of the NPS's nominations for the

[179] Oscar L. Chapman, Acting Secretary of the Interior, to Hon. Robert P. Patterson, Secretary of War, 25 February 1947, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2917, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, Japan, 1933–49, NARA.
[180] Ibid. Italics mine.
[181] Edgar Erskine Hume, Colonel, GSC, Chief, Reorientation Branch, Civil Affairs Division, to Newton B. Drury, Director, National Park Service, 16 January 1948, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2917, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, Japan, 1933–49, NARA.

consultant position, was selected for the job.[182] Richey noted that co-operation with Japan in training landscape architects would be good and could achieve positive results in Japan: "any assistance that can be given by American universities in training Japanese Nationals in the planning field would be a great assistance to the occupation in the rehabilitation of Japan."[183] Richey's insights on Japan's national parks were gathered together in his report "A Study of Japanese National Parks, April-August 1948" and also published as an article titled "National Parks of Japan" in *National Parks Magazine* (April-June 1949). In his estimation, "the greatest deficiency in the national park policy of Japan" was that parks did not include the protection of wildlife. (This stood in contrast with the United States, as the American park idea placed great importance on charismatic big game.) He also noted something of the differences in how Americans and the Japanese rated the importance of national parks: "the significance of national parks to the Japanese people and to Americans is altogether different. To the Japanese, there is no question as to the priority of importance of their first three parks…" Americans, according to Richey, would pick completely different Japanese parks. (The American focus was on magnificent landscapes, like mountains and the signs of geologic processes.)[184]

In his article on Japan's national parks in *National Parks Magazine*, Richey seemed to employ American-style scenic standards to his descriptions of Japan's national parks. One park contained islands that "constitute one of the most beautiful seascapes in all the world, forming a national park of a quality unique in the world." Another national park was "a mountain paradise of rugged peaks, sheer precipices, deep gorges, clear streams and similar features comprising a mountaineer's recreational area of first magnitude." In the article, Richey drew a direct connection from Yellowstone to Japan's national parks by quoting Dr. Tsuyoshi Tamura, the "so called 'Father of Japanese National Parks,'" who had articulated the relevance of Yellowstone to his country by noting that "As early as immediately following the establishment of the

[182] Kenneth C. Royall, Secretary of the Army, to the Secretary of the Interior, 26 February 1948, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2917, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, Japan, 1933–49, NARA.
[183] Charles A. Richey, Assistant Chief, Land and Recreational Planning, memo to Mr. Doerr, 18 November 1948, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2917, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, Japan, 1933–49, NARA.
[184] Charles A. Richey, Assistant Chief, Land and Recreational Planning, memo to Mr. Calahane, 25 May 1949, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2917, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, Japan, 1933–49, NARA.

Yellowstone National Park, in March 1872, some of the Japanese pioneers returning from the United States advocated a similar enterprise in Japan." It, however, took some time for the idea to materialize. After quoting Tamura, Richey noted that "it is evident that the [Japanese national park] system was patterned on the American national parks, with some adaptations from the Canadian and European systems," but that they had been forced to make modifications to their system based on national conditions as "in trying to follow the American pattern, where large areas of land are dedicated solely to park use without serious modification, and under the National Park Service, it proved so much of a strain on the Japanese economy that some innovations were necessary." Therefore, there were certain areas in Japanese national parks in which resource utilization was permitted. Richey concluded that Japan did not have enough national park areas for the needs of its population, as well as gave his recommendations on future park development.[185] In 1953, Richey noted that the Japanese had made great progress in park work, "although in any evaluation of the Japanese National Parks System one must take into consideration the concept of the national park idea in Japan which is partially based upon the Canadian and European systems of national parks and related to different land use and economic principals than our own."[186]

Many Japanese officials connected with national parks visited the United States in the 1950s. For example, in 1951 Acting Director of the National Park Service, Conrad L. Wirth wrote a memorandum to the Superintendent of Carlsbad Caverns National Park regarding an upcoming visit by Mr. Kyohei Horikawa and Mr. Shigeasu Kosugi from the Japanese Diet. Wirth noted that "The Department of the Army is particularly anxious, as is this Service, that these two men be shown every possible consideration as they are very highly placed in the Japanese Government." He continued that "Both of these men are in extremely strategic and influential positions with respect to national park work in Japan," thereby he hoped that the NPS staff would assist the visitors in getting as much as possible out of their visit.[187] The National Park

[185] Charles A. Richey, "National Parks of Japan," *National Parks Magazine* 23, 97 (April-June 1949): 16–20.
[186] Charles A. Richey, Chief of Lands, to Mr. George C. Ruhle, Hawaii National Park, 17 September 1953, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2179, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Japan, 1950–63, NARA.
[187] Conrad L. Wirth, Acting Director, the National Park Service, memorandum to the Superintendent, Carlsbad Caverns National Park, 23 November 1951, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2179, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Japan, 1950–63, NARA.

Service issued a press release on the visit of Mr. Minoru Iijima, "director of national parks in Japan" in 1950. The press release read:

> Newton B. Drury, director of the National Park Service, pointed out that SCAP's Public Health and Welfare Section, the Army unit in charge of Japanese recreational work, believes that reconstruction of the national park system is important to Japan's economic recovery and that, particularly since the country is overcrowded and possesses few other healthful recreational facilities, national parks offer an effective means of improving the physical and mental well-being of the Japanese people.[188]

Charles A. Richey wrote the Chief of Information in September 1950 that Mr. Iijima had expressed his wish "to obtain a film on national park use in this country that he could show in Japan and explain to the people something about national park use." The most appropriate film for this purpose would be the Ford Company's film on Yellowstone. Richey noted that showing this film "is probably one of the best ways to put across the national park idea in Japan."[189] Ultimately, Richey was able to secure the film and instructed the American authorities in Japan to pass it on to Dr. T. Tamura, who advised the Welfare Ministry on national park matters. Richey noted in October 1951 that in the future, he would be interested in hearing how useful officials in Japan had found the film.[190] In American national park documents, it was often pointed out what an important role the national park system played in the economic recovery of Japan and the well-being of the Japanese people as well as in the development of democracy in the country.[191]

In the early 1950s, it was noted in Japan that the country's parks were progressing well and that the American example had helped in this. As Naotake Sato,

[188] Department of the Interior, Information Service, National Park Service, For release July 25, 1950, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2179, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Japan, 1950–63, NARA.
[189] Charles A. Richey, Chief of Land Planning, memorandum to Chief of Information, 26 September 1950, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2179, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Japan, 1950–63, NARA.
[190] Charles A. Richey, Chief of Lands, to Col. D. R. Nugent, Chief, Civil Information and Education Section, SCAP, 29 October 1951, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2179, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Japan, 1950–63, NARA.
[191] "Exchange of Persons Program with Japan," RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2179, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Japan, 1950–63, NARA.

President of National Parks Association in Japan, noted to Director Wirth: "our national parks are gradually showing a fairly good progress in various ways lately, by taking the system of your national parks as patterns."[192] Sato continued by noting very politely that Japanese park officials were grateful to the United States National Park Service as well as to the National Parks Association,

> in constantly giving a generous support and encouragement in many ways toward the development and improvement of the national parks of this country, and I wish [to] assure you that we shall, of course, continue our utmost efforts on this vital problem of mankind, and to eventually justify the expectation you repose in us.[193]

Two things were central to post-war American-Japanese park relations. It was important to note that Japan was looking to the U.S. for help and also that parks were argued to be good for Japan's development and for democracy. The U.S. park system provided good model for Japan and it was considered beneficial that Japanese officials toured American parks. It was important to make the Japanese people understand the value of the nation's scenery and the benefits of national parks.

While the U.S. National Park Service's thoughts on Japan were mostly focused on how the Japanese parks system could benefit from co-operation with the U.S. and making the Japanese people realize the value of national parks, American park officials also realized the potential benefit to the American park system gained by taking advantage of examples from Japan's parks system. In the mid-1960s, it was pointed out that the U.S. could look to the Japanese system for a model of how to manage the ever-growing visitor pressures on parks:

> We have long regarded an exchange with Japan to be of high potential because the Japanese national parks are currently serving many millions more visitors than are United States parks. The Japanese, therefore, are

[192] Naotake Sato, President, National Parks Association, to Conrad L. Wirth, Director, National Park Service, 30 April 1953, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2170, File: L66 [Foreign Parks], Land Planning Division, Japan, 1946–54, NARA.
[193] Ibid.

> meeting situations that we expect to meet within a very few years. The United States would profit substantially from a careful analysis by its own personnel of the methods and techniques utilized by the Japanese National Park Service to serve large numbers of visitors.[194]

It is interesting, however, to note that the United States was looking to Japan for help in purely practical matters, such as the overcrowding of parks due to increasing visitor numbers, but its own promotion of the American park idea and its benefits in Japan was also based on an ideological dimension besides the tangible benefits offered by parks.

Promotion of American national parks and park practices occurred also through international nature conservation meetings, which will now be addressed.

2.2. National Park Conferences, Conservation Co-operation, and an Office for International Affairs: Institutionalizing the National Park Idea as an American Idea

The National Park Service took it with great interest that other countries saw the national park idea as an American idea. In December 1947, Director Newton B. Drury noted with delight that national parks were mentioned as being an American invention in Britain. He had received a reprint of an article entitled "Nature Protection in Great Britain" from the October issue of *Nature*, and he wrote back to Britain with thanks and compliments about their achievements. Interestingly, Drury also noted: "It is gratifying to know of your recognition of Yellowstone as the birthplace of the national park concept."[195] This sub-chapter argues that international conservation meetings and American international programs were important avenues for constructing the national park idea as an American idea.

Many international conservation meetings were held during the 20th century—some long before the post-war gatherings that provided a platform for

[194] Theodor R. Swem, Assistant Director, Cooperative Activities, memorandum to Assistent to the Science Advisor, 4 May 1965, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2180, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Japan, 1964–65, NARA.

[195] Newton B. Drury, Director, National Park Service, to Mr. G. F. Herbert Smith, Society for the Promotion of Nature Reserves, British Museum, England, 10 December 1947, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 2916, File: 0–30 Proposed Foreign Parks, England, 1934–47, NARA.

consolidating the American origin of the national park idea. For example, in 1913 there was a Swiss-led International Conference for the Protection of Nature in Basel, Switzerland. After this meeting, the outbreak of the First World War hindered further development of international co-operation in nature conservation. Some important events in global nature protection took place in the early 1930s, with conservation meetings organized in Europe. Perhaps the most important of these meetings was the 1933 London Convention, which was especially concerned with the protection of African fauna and flora and advocated for the creation of additional national parks in Africa. The Pan-American Union gathered preservationists from North American and South American countries to meet in the United States in 1940. The late 1940s saw a massive step forward for international nature conservation with the founding of the International Union for the Protection of Nature (IUPN) in 1948. In 1956, the organization became known as the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN).[196]

In the post-war years, international co-operation assumed a larger role in nature conservation. From the late 1940s onwards, Americans took the leading role in conference attendance and in organizing them. Geopolitics also affected conservation conferences, for example in limiting the presence of participants from certain countries. Conferences for conservation experts were also important in the sense that they enabled co-operation and connections with Communist countries—even though these countries were seriously underrepresented at post-war conservation conferences. Strong colonial networks, the American influence at post-war conservation conferences, and sciences such as ecology and wildlife management led international conservation co-operation to be largely focused on "pristine" "wilderness" landscapes in the colonies (as opposed to European cultural landscapes).[197]

International meetings helped promote the greatness of the national park idea, and through them, the park idea was also articulated as an American invention. The United Nations had noted the importance of national parks for the sustainable use of natural resources, and in the 1950s the UN Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC)

[196] For a brief overview of international conservation meetings, see, for example, Roderick Nash, *Wilderness and the American Mind*, 4th ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001 [1967]), 358–378.
[197] Raf De Bont, Simone Schleper and Hans Schouwenburg, "Conservation Conferences and Expert Networks in the Short Twentieth Century," *Environment and History* 23 (2017): 569–599.

approved compiling a list of national parks and equivalent reserves around the world, a resolution sponsored by the U.S. and some other countries. "The resolution noted that most member nations of the United Nations have set aside national parks and other reserves to protect resources contributing to the inspiration, culture and welfare of mankind and that they are valuable for economic and scientific reasons and for preservation of fauna, flora and geological structures." The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) was to assist in this effort, and the work was to be undertaken by the U.S.-based International Committee on National Parks. The UN paper mentioned many tangible benefits of national parks and it also noted that "The ECOSOC vote was unanimous," with representatives emphasizing "the importance of national parks as a means of preserving every nation's heritage of scenic and natural beauty for future generations." Interestingly, the paper also mentioned that "Several delegates, including the representative of the USSR, commented that the national park concept is a contribution to world peace…"[198] David Ekbladh notes that the ECOSOC and, perhaps more successfully, other more specialized UN institutions were platforms for international development ideas and modernization programs.[199]

The material prepared in the United States for including the national parks item to the UN's agenda included a speech by the U.S. representative supporting the adoption of the resolution. The speech noted that "The United States is especially pleased to sponsor this proposal because it was in Wyoming, in 1872," that the national park idea was first realized with the establishment of Yellowstone, "the first national park in the world." The draft of the speech then mentioned the growth of the American park system ever since, followed by a brief overview of the creation of national parks around the world and their many benefits. [200] The American address ended by noting that

[198] International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, International Committee on National Parks, Washington, DC, "United Nations Recognizes International Significance of National Parks," 4 May 1959, RG 59, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Office of International Economic and Social Affairs, Records Pertaining to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, 1957–1959, Box 18, File: 7. Establishment by SYG a List of National Parks and Equivalent Reserves, 1958–1959, NARA.
[199] Ekbladh, *Great American Mission*, 87–91.
[200] Annex II to SD/E/1208, RG 59, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Office of International Economic and Social Affairs, Records Pertaining to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, 1957–1959, Box 18, File: 7. Establishment by SYG a List of National Parks and Equivalent Reserves, 1958–1959, NARA.

> We in the United States have learned by sad experience that the time to act to safeguard our heritage by reserving its outstanding assets as national parks and reserves is before the lands are submitted to pressures of change by civilization. There is still opportunity for most nations to preserve a more comprehensive national park system than now exists.[201]

It is interesting how the address mentioned the American invention of the park idea, grounding the park idea as American intellectual property that had originated with the Washburn Expedition (which will be examined more thoroughly in the next chapter of this study). The United States was also a forerunner in having realized the importance of national parks and could now advise other countries to do the same. It was also important to the United States to make sure that other countries understood that the national park idea was not just about United States leadership or interests, but that the promotion of national parks would bring with it worldwide benefits. State Department papers specifically mentioned that "There has been some misunderstanding as to motives behind the United States proposal, and every effort should be made to emphasize the benefit that international recognition can bring to these areas."[202]

Different national beginnings and stories were fused under a common origin story. In the IUCN's informational booklet (from the late 1950s), under the heading "Origin of the National Park Concept," the idea of national parks was presented with the familiar campfire narrative. It linked national park creation worldwide to the American origin story, noting that after its creation, Yellowstone "thereafter served as a guiding beacon in the development of parks and reserves throughout the world over a period of 89 years."[203] Despite many earlier efforts at nature conservation, the birth of the national park idea had an exact beginning time and place—Yellowstone. It was,

---

[201] Ibid.

[202] Economic and Social Council, Position Paper, Establishment by the Secretary General of a List of National Parks or Equivalent Reserves, Item 7, SD/E/1208, 18 March 1959, RG 59, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Office of International Economic and Social Affairs, Records Pertaining to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, 1957–1959, Box 18, File: 7. Establishment by SYG a List of National Parks and Equivalent Reserves, 1958–1959, NARA.

[203] Booklet "The International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources has established an International Committee on National Parks to further the national park program throughout the world," RG 59, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Office of International Economic and Social Affairs, Records Pertaining to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, 1957–1959, Box 18, File: 7. Establishment by SYG a List of National Parks and Equivalent Reserves, 1958–1959, NARA. Quote from p. 3.

however, mentioned that Yosemite, in 1864, had provided an even earlier example of a new use for public lands. Finally, it suggested that the legislation establishing the U.S. National Park Service had served as an example for many other nations.[204]

Interestingly, then, in a booklet promoting national parks and their benefits worldwide, only the early American developments received attention, even though there had been many earlier efforts at nature conservation. This was indeed about claiming the national park idea as an American invention. Nowhere did it mention that certain developments elsewhere had preceded developments in the United States, such as the creation of the Canadian Dominion Parks Branch in 1911—five years before its American counterpart. The booklet summarized the history of international co-operation on national parks, highlighting conservation conferences and organizations of the 20th century, most prominently the International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources. The booklet ended with a list of significant dates in conservation history. The first effort mentioned was the establishment of a natural reserve in the forest of Fontainebleau in France in 1853. The next three major events, however, were American developments: the establishment of Yosemite, Yellowstone, and the National Park Service.[205]

In the 1950s, it was common for the National Park Service to stress the many great benefits of the park idea. A National Park Service publication from 1957, *The National Park Story in Pictures* by Isabelle F. Story, was one such example. The publication's foreword by the Director Conrad L. Wirth noted that, "The saga of national parks indirectly chronicles the greatness of our Nation."[206] *The National Park Story in Pictures* connected the national park idea with "the essence of democracy" and noted that "The philosophy of national parks now is inextricably woven into the fabric of our national life." Isabelle Story continued by saying that, "In its idealism, laced with practicality, it takes its place with the motivating factors that resulted in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights..." The booklet recounted the famous narrative of the discovery and establishment of Yellowstone as the world's first

[204] Ibid.
[205] Ibid.
[206] US Department of the Interior, *The National Park Story in Pictures* (Washington DC: US Government Printing Office, 1957), quote from foreword, RG 59, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Office of International Economic and Social Affairs, Records Pertaining to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, 1957–1959, Box 18, File: The National Park Story in Pictures, 1957–1957, NARA.

national park.[207] The booklet promoted the American national parks system with magnificent pictures of national park areas. It is likely that this booklet was sent abroad as well, so it served as yet another advertisement for the American park idea and its benefits.

**

Two developments that institutionalized the park idea as American intellectual property took place around the same time in the early 1960s: the creation of an international activities office (the Division of International Affairs) within the NPS in 1961 and the organization of the First World Conference on National Parks in Seattle in 1962.

The NPS found itself responding to a growing number of requests for help from abroad and felt that international affairs should be handled in a more organized manner. Director Wirth, speaking on the matter in March 1961, noted: "I want the office to start on the basis of being something else except a place to answer correspondence which comes to us. In other words, we should try to do something else other than catch the ball when it is thrown at us." The time was now right for such an endeavor, as the Service had a knowledgeable staff member available. Wirth thought the National Park Service should see what kind of an international program it could put together and how it could be done. He wanted the U.S. National Park Service to reach a prominent position in international park affairs: "We are far behind and I not only want to catch up but want to reach a position of leadership as quickly as possible."[208] That the National Park Service saw assisting other countries in park matters as its responsibility was also used in this line of argumentation. Wirth noted: "This country should be in a position to fulfill its responsibilities as a leader in park and recreational-area planning and be

[207] US Department of the Interior, *The National Park Story in Pictures* (Washington DC: US Government Printing Office, 1957), quotes from p. 1, RG 59, Bureau of International Organization Affairs, Office of International Economic and Social Affairs, Records Pertaining to the United Nations Economic and Social Council, 1957–1959, Box 18, File: The National Park Story in Pictures, 1957–1957, NARA.
[208] Conrad L. Wirth, Director, memorandum "International Park Movement" to Messrs. Tolson, Thompson, Beard, and Ruhle, 17 March 1961, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2170, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Cooperation with Foreign Agencies, 1958–63, NARA.

prepared to share its technical knowledge in these matters with other nations and international organizations."[209]

Already in May 1960, Director Wirth had sent a response to Frank Masland Jr.'s letter and his "suggestion of setting up a special division within the National Park Service for the purpose of handling matters pertaining to 'International Cooperative Efforts.'" Wirth thought there was "considerable merit to this suggestion" and even if the Service did not have funding available for such an endeavor, he was "giving serious consideration to seeing if we can't get it in our next budget which is now being prepared."[210]

That the national park idea was an American idea was mentioned in the effort to establish an office for international activities. "The national park idea originated in the United States and has since been adopted by many countries," wrote Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall to Secretary of State Dean Rusk. "The American concept of national parks has of necessity been modified in other countries to meet their particular requirements." Even if there were differences in park progress and development around the world, close co-operation in national park matters was essential: "This is a field in which the United States has much to give to others and much to learn from others." Udall hoped that the assistance in park problems provided by the United States to other countries could be consolidated and boosted. This would "result in both cultural and financial benefit to other nations and to the United States."[211]

All in all, the international dimension was considered an important component of American park programs. For example, officials noted that visiting foreign diplomats could easily include national park areas in their visits if planned in advance. Clearly, this is another example of how the national park idea could be used to showcase positive sides of the United States and American culture. Fred M. Packard of

[209] Conrad L. Wirth, Director, memo "Legislative proposal to authorize cooperation with other nations and international organizations in park and recreational area planning" to Legislative Counsel, Office of the Solicitor Through: Assistant Secretary, Public Land Management, 6 June 1960, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2170, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Cooperation with Foreign Agencies, 1958–63, NARA.

[210] Conrad L. Wirth, Director, to Mr. F. E. Masland, Jr., Carlisle, Pennsylvania, 5 May 1960, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2170, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Cooperation with Foreign Agencies, 1958–63, NARA.

[211] Stewart L. Udall, Secretary of the Interior, to Dean Rusk, Secretary of State, 1 May 1961, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2170, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Cooperation with Foreign Agencies, 1958–63, NARA.

the Division of International Affairs wrote to the Department of State to note that the Division would be happy to help plan itineraries for such visitors and that this matter should be discussed, so that international visitors could "see natural beauties and historical sites they otherwise would miss."[212] Packard went so far as to note that, "There is no better way to develop international appreciation of the beauty and character of the United States than to show people in other lands what our National Parks are like," in a letter thanking the Union Pacific Railroad Company for photographs it had provided. In fact, many foreigners "are inspired to visit the United States to see for themselves." Therefore it was important to secure the best possible photos for publications and exhibits.[213]

Indeed, many foreigners visited American national parks and received courteous assistance from American park personnel. For instance, in 1965, two German teachers toured national parks in the U.S. and were impressed by them. The NPS noted the informal work of park employees in recognizing the opportunity to provide extra assistance to these foreign visitors. It was thought that the hospitality provided by park personnel to international visitors contributed to promoting international understanding.[214] When more official visits took place, superintendents of parks were often informed beforehand, with officials asking that the best possible assistance be extended to visitors. For example, in February 1966 C. Gordon Fredine, Chief of the Division of International Affairs, informed the Superintendent of Grand Canyon National Park of the impending visit of an important person from Malaysia. Mr. Melan was "the editor of Malaysia's leading newspaper" and also responsible for many other publications. Fredine advised the superintendent that "In this capacity he [Mr. Melan] exerts considerable influence on the foreign policy of his country and its relations with the United States. The Department of State has requested that special courtesies be

[212] Fred M. Packard, Division of International Affairs, to Mr. Julian Nicholas, Office of Protocol, U. S. Department of State, 22 September 1964, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2170, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Washington Office, 1964–69, NARA.
[213] Fred M. Packard, Division of International Affairs, to Mr. Barry B. Combs, Union Pacific Railway Company, 25 May 1964, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2170, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Washington Office, 1964–69, NARA.
[214] Theodor R. Swem, Assistant Director, Cooperative Activities, National Park Service, memorandum to Superintendents, Wind Cave, Badlands, 10 November 1965; Jess H. Lombard, Superintendent, Wind Cave National Park, memorandum to Regional Director, Midwest Region, 8 October 1965; Don F. Gillespie, Park Ranger, Wind Cave, memorandum to Superintendent, Wind Cave, 7 October 1965, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2171, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, International Cooperation (Cooperation with Other Nations), 1964–69, Pt. 1, NARA.

extended to Mr. Melan …"[215] National Park Service staff prepared detailed programs and itineraries for international visitors so that they could make the most of their visits.[216] The NPS was interested in providing effective assistance to international visitors and compiled information on the types of assistance offered in national parks to visitors from other countries.[217]

A National Park Service document from the 1960s outlined the need for and forms of international activity. Conservation was an urgent need around the world, which agencies had noted:

> In this setting [The UN and the IUCN], as well as through direct official cooperation among governments, the National Park Service has played an increasingly useful role in helping other nations profit from its past experience and in gathering the fruits of their experience for the benefit of the United States.[218]

In this memo, the National Park Service's international program was divided into five categories: assistance to foreign visitors who toured American parks, special services such as language facilities, special programs such as the African Student Program (which is discussed in detail later in this chapter), direct cooperation with other nations in many different forms, and Visit U.S.A. Programs, in which national park areas were promoted to tourists. The document ended, fittingly, with the assertion that "national parks are of international significance."[219] In thinking about international assistance, one

[215] C. Gordon Fredine, Chief, Division of International Affairs, memorandum to Superintendent, Grand Canyon, 9 February 1966, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2170, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Washington Office, 1964–69, NARA. There are numerous mentions of similar international visitors and visits to American parks in these files.
[216] See, for example, Draft Program and Itinerary, Mr. J. R. Labuschagne, Deputy Director of National Parks, Republic of South Africa, 7 January 1966, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2182, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, South Africa, 1966–67, NARA.
[217] Theodor R. Swem, Assistant Director, Cooperative Activities, National Park Service, informational memorandum to All Field Offices, 1 May 1964, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2171, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, International Cooperation (Cooperation with Other Nations), 1964–69, Pt. 1, NARA.
[218] "The National Park Service and International Affairs," RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2170, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Washington Office, 1964–69, NARA.
[219] Ibid.

park official even stated that all American foreign aid should be tied to promoting conservation and national parks.[220]

Still, the fact that the National Park Service needed to pay attention to international activities was not a self-evident matter. In 1964, an associate of the NPS, C. A. Kinsley of Eastman Kodak Company, put into words his astonishment over the fact that the Park Service had an office for international affairs—and probably was not the only one wondering about this fact. He wrote to Myron D. Sutton, Assistant Chief of the Division of International Affairs:

> You have a new title. Congratulations! Both John and I are a little curious as to *what a Division of International Affairs is doing in the National Park Service. I thought our national parks were restricted to the Unites States and possessions.*[221]

Kinsley continued with a wish to hear more about this effort: "Next time you write tell us a little more about this department and your work."[222] Sutton's reply explained the purpose of the newly established office:

> Apart from the fact that friendship among nations is encouraged by interchange of knowledge about their heritage, more than 80 nations actually have national parks or equivalent reserves, and a great many of the new and developing nations want them.[223]

---

[220] George Baggley, Associate Regional Director, Midwest Region, National Park Service, memorandum to The Director, 11 December 1964, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2171, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, International Cooperation (Cooperation with Other Nations), 1964–69, Pt. 1, NARA. "It seems to me, with United States' aid going to so many countries, that there should be a very definite tie-in to natural resource use and conservation. An effort should be made to sell parks and conservation of resources on the basis of their proven social and economic returns to a country and also that most of these backward countries can establish parks, forest reservations, or conservation areas with very little difficulty." This, however, seems to be just a brief mention in the records.

[221] C. A. Kinsley, Manager, Correspondence Service, Sales Service Division, Eastman Kodak Company, Rochester, New York, to Myron D. Sutton, Assistant Chief, Division of International Affairs, U.S. Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Washington D.C., 16 March 1964, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2170, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Washington Office, 1964–69, NARA. Italics mine.

[222] Ibid.

[223] Myron D. Sutton, Assistant Chief, Division of International Affairs, to Mr. C. A. Kinsley, Eastman Kodak Company, 26 March 1964, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2170, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Washington Office, 1964–69, NARA.

Sutton detailed the tremendous amount of attention that had been placed on national parks internationally and noted that many important organizations, such as the United Nations, were invested in them. After establishing the general importance of national parks, he went on to explain why it was the U.S. National Park Service in particular that was involved in international affairs:

> The United States, which established the world's first national park, has nearly 100 years of experience in park management. As a result of the burgeoning world interest in parks, the United States occupies a leading position in international park co-operation.
>
> From this, I think you can see why we never have a dull minute around here. There are interchanges, training programs, language programs, and international conferences, to name a few of the activities in which this Service is engaged.[224]

This is an interesting exchange, as it shows the assumption that national parks were an American thing—so why would they have an international dimension?

The First World Conference on National Parks and Equivalent Reserves in Seattle in 1962 was an especially useful chance for the United States to demonstrate the value of the national park idea. As the conference announcement highlighted:

> The conference will give the United States a chance to demonstrate the most useful attributes of its National Park System conservation program, and to explain American means and methods of meeting the parks challenge, some of which will work in other parts of the world. It will give U.S. participants the benefit of comment and criticism from visiting park men—we will gain new ideas to put to work in our dynamic American park scene.[225]

---

[224] Ibid.

[225] "UN, IUCN, and the World's National Parks: Announcing the first World Conference on National Parks, at the Century 21 Exposition, Seattle, Summer 1962" Reprint from *Pacific Discovery* (Vol. XIV, No. 4, July-August, 1961, pp. 26–27), RG 43, Administrative Files 1928–1967, Box 177, File: Parks, World Conf. on National, Seattle, July 1–8, 1962, NARA.

The conference gave the United States a chance to prove that the nation was about more than just the quest for material gain, for example great cultural work like the country's national parks. Secretary of Interior Stewart Udall noted: "Today as a nation so often falsely painted as being obsessed by materialism, we can take pride in our leadership in providing opportunities for the significant spiritual and nontangible values which our parks afford."[226]

Even though the First World Conference on National Parks was not an intergovernmental assembly, the United States was very much interested in making sure there would be widespread participation and suitable attendees for the conference. There was a great deal of discussion about whether the National Park Service could act as a co-sponsor of the conference, given the conference's non-governmental status and since the U.S. was not a member of the IUCN, and about whether invitations should be extended on behalf of the U.S. government, or preferably, by the IUCN.[227] Still, the U.S. placed great importance on making it a success and ensuring wide international participation. For example, it was thought that American ambassadors should try to help in securing suitable participants for the conference. "It is important that American ambassadors in invited countries do everything possible to encourage the governments to send strong efficient delegates," wrote John A. Carver, Jr., Assistant Secretary of the Interior, to Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary of State.[228] It would be ideal to attract high-ranking officials such as ministers in appropriate fields. Carver continued by saying that "This is the first international meeting ever held to promote the national park movement on a worldwide basis."[229] It was no coincidence that the meeting took place in the United States:

[226] Stewart Udall quoted in "Interior Secretary Udall to Head United States Delegation to First World Conference on National Parks" United States Department of the Interior news release, Office of the Secretary, For Release to AM's, June 18, 1962, RG 43, Administrative Files 1928–1967, Box 177, File: Parks, World Conf. on National, Seattle, July 1–8, 1962, NARA.
[227] This file includes are many documents on this matter. An example is Richard C. Hagan, Chief, Program Staff, Office of International Conferences, to Mr. Carl R. Sharek, Second Secretary, American Legation, Budapest, Hungary, 6 March 1962, RG 43, Administrative Files 1928–1967, Box 177, File: Parks, World Conf. on National, Seattle, July 1–8, 1962, NARA.
[228] John A. Carver, Jr., Assistant Secretary, Department of the Interior, to Harlan Cleveland, Assistant Secretary, Department of State, 12 January 1962, RG 43, Administrative Files 1928–1967, Box 177, File: Parks, World Conf. on National, Seattle, July 1–8, 1962, NARA.
[229] Ibid.

> It is internationally recognized that the first national park for public good was established in Yellowstone in 1872, which led to the formation of a national park system. Evolution of this system has progressed to its highest stage within the United States and our national parks. *More than 70 countries have willingly followed the lead of America in setting up their own national parks and equivalent reserves*. For these reasons the International Union and all of its members and participating nations of the world have chosen the United States as the site for the First World Conference, for which fact we as Americans must feel properly grateful and proud. I am particularly delighted that the National Park Service can now officially act as a host for the Conference.[230]

Many countries were interested in participating in the conference but lacked the funds to do so. Some countries suspected participation might not be sufficiently beneficial. The Government of Iran, for example, could not send a delegate to the conference. It was noted that Iran's "position in this matter is dictated by genuine financial stringency and does not reflect a lack of interest in the purposes of the Conference."[231] Interestingly, it was not clear to all countries that there evidently was this common national park idea or that parks around the world sprang from the same ideals and that therefore countries could benefit from sharing experiences. For example, the United Kingdom had decided not to participate:

> A reply has now been received from the Foreign Office to the effect that since the national parks in the United Kingdom differ from those in other countries of the world in being concerned with the preservation of landscape rather than of flora and fauna, the conference is unlikely to be relevant to conditions in the United Kingdom.

[230] Ibid. Italics mine.
[231] Department of State Airgram (Departmental and Foreign Service) "First World Conference on National Parks, Seattle, June 30 – July 7, 1962," to Secstate from Tehran, 29 March 1962, RG 43, Administrative Files 1928–1967, Box 177, File: Parks, World Conf. on National, Seattle, July 1–8, 1962, NARA.

> The Embassy has, therefore, been informed that no delegates will be attending from this country.[232]

This illustrates that perhaps not all countries saw the national park as a common idea or that national parks and park co-operation were crucial for the social and economic development of countries. Therefore, it seems that the American notion of national parks and the idea that all parks sprang from Yellowstone's example had not yet been universally accepted. All in all, exchanges about the First World Conference on National Parks and its participation illustrated the special interest and ownership the U.S. showed in the matter of national parks and promoting the national park idea abroad.

There was discussion on just how much the U.S. National Park Service should and could do with respect to international park matters. John S. McLaughlin, Superintendent of Grand Canyon National Park, wrote to Daniel B. Beard, Assistant Director of National Park Service, after the First World Conference on National Parks in 1962. McLaughlin noted that some African participants had been disappointed with the lack of tangible assistance from the United States in park matters. He noted that "the national park field is one where it is universally accepted and recognized that this Country has blazed the trail." He continued: "Additionally, this Nation is respected for its knowledge and knowhow in an area that obviously has no capitalistic implications."[233] In his reply, Assistant Director Beard confirmed that "We certainly have learned from the Seattle Conference, that the rest of the world looks to us as the leaders of national park work." Beard, too, felt that the United States should be more active in helping in international park matters. However, funding for international park work was insufficient.[234]

---

[232] Operations memorandum "Educational and Cultural Exchange: First World Conference on National Parks, Seattle. June 30 – July 7, 1962," to Department of State from Amembassy, London, 3 April 1962, RG 43, Administrative Files 1928–1967, Box 177, File: Parks, World Conf. on National, Seattle, July 1–8, 1962, NARA.

[233] John S. McLaughlin, Superintendent, Grand Canyon National Park, to Daniel B. Beard, Assistant Director, National Park Service, 2 August 1962, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2172, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1961–69, Pt. 1, NARA.

[234] Daniel B. Beard, Assistant Director, National Park Service, to John S. McLaughlin, Superintendent, Grand Canyon National Park, 23 August 1962, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2172, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1961–69, Pt. 1, NARA.

Funding for international park conferences and programs came from other sources as well, such as foundations, which were important contributors to making these events happen. Private philanthropies like the Ford Foundation and the Rockefeller Foundation were an important part of the American modernization agenda abroad during the Cold War years, as they were committed to international development and promoting peace and democracy. In Europe, foundations worked alongside the U.S. government to support cultural and educational activities that promoted American ideology, whereas in the developing countries the focus of the work was on agricultural development.[235] An important way in which foundations (such as the Rockefeller Foundation and the Ford Foundation) participated in bolstering the park idea as an American invention was through their support for the participants of international programs, such as the World Conferences on National Parks and the International Seminars on National Parks and Equivalent Reserves.

The First World Conference on National Parks, organized in Seattle in the summer of 1962, was a major event in international conservation co-operation. Harold J. Coolidge from the IUCN wrote to the Ford Foundation for support for foreign participants at the 1962 conference. He mentioned Yellowstone as the beginning of parks worldwide, noting that "The United States was chosen as the site for the meeting in recognition of U. S. leadership in the national parks field where the first national park for public good was established…" Coolidge's list of results expected from the meeting included the transfer of knowledge and technical information to those countries that needed it, but also more idealistic goals—perhaps mentioned to appeal to the foundation's commitment to international development:

> World attention will be focused on the contribution of national parks to the cause of international peace by the role they can play towards the

[235] Ekbladh, *Great American Mission*, 167–169; Olivier Zunz, *Philanthropy in America: A History* (Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2012), 137–159. This study does not examine foundations as such or their international development work in more detail, as my focus here is directed only to examples of how foundations contributed to the funding of park conferences. For more on the foundations, see, for example, Inderjeet Parmar, *Foundations of the American Century: The Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2012).

> inspiration, culture, and welfare of mankind, in addition to their values for economic and scientific purposes.[236]

He then outlined the budget for the conference and stressed the need for foundation support for the travel of foreign delegates. After all, the First World Conference on National Parks was considered of crucial importance for many countries, which "have inherited parks and reserves from colonial regimes, and are now making an appraisal as to whether they should be continued or whether the areas should be turned over for agricultural use and the wild life that inhabits them slaughtered." Coolidge hoped travel grants could be secured for foreign participants, such as those from African countries, to help in this transition and ensure that national parks and any progress in nature conservation would not be dissolved. The conference would be very important, as "this program will have an impact on foreign nations that look to the United States as source of inspiration, guidance, and assistance."[237]

The Ford Foundation granted 15,000 dollars of funding to IUCN for bringing participants from Central and South American, African, Asian, and Middle Eastern countries to the conference. This, however, was only a portion of the needed funding and would "enable the representatives of ten or more additional developing countries to attend the conference."[238] In writing to the foundation after the conference, Coolidge noted that the success of the event "can be attributed in no small measure to the participation of the foreign members, many of whom received support from the Ford Foundation grant we had," while also providing an impressive account of the achievements of the conference as well as a list of foreign participants funded with the grant money.[239] It is noteworthy that in seeking support for the 1962 conference, the

[236] Harold J. Coolidge, International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, to Mr. F. F. Hill, Vice President, The Ford Foundation, 3 April 1962, The Ford Foundation, Reel 0659, Series: Ford Foundation Grants - H to K, Grant 06200330, Ford Foundation records, Grants H-K (FA732D), RAC.
[237] Ibid.
[238] Program action, 24 June 1962; International Affairs, International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, First World Conference on National Parks, 8 May 1962, The Ford Foundation, Reel 0659, Series: Ford Foundation Grants - H to K, Grant 06200330, Ford Foundation records, Grants H-K (FA732D), RAC.
[239] Harold J. Coolidge, International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, to Mr. Joseph M. McDaniel, Jr., Secretary, The Ford Foundation, 8 October 1962, The Ford Foundation, Reel 0659, Series: Ford Foundation Grants - H to K, Grant 06200330, Ford Foundation records, Grants H-K (FA732D), RAC.

importance of American leadership in national parks was stressed to American foundations. It could be said that American foundations were participants in supporting the narrative of parks as a great American innovation in this way.

The Rockefeller Brothers Fund sponsored the travel of foreign representatives to several international programs aimed at distributing park knowledge, for example to the 1974 International Seminar on National Parks and Equivalent Reserves. This support enabled five foreign participants to attend, including two participants from Guatemala, two from Honduras, and one from Nicaragua.[240] Honduras and Nicaragua were represented for the first time at the seminar.[241] All in all, the 1974 seminar included 38 participants from 27 countries. One of the participants sponsored by the RBF, Professor Mario Dary from Guatemala, represented all seminar participants and delivered a speech at the seminar's graduation ceremony.[242] In his address, Dary offered his conclusions on the seminar, praising its usefulness. He noted, for example, that "National Parks are a form of rescuing and saving the world's genetic patrimony" and that "National Parks constitute a legitimate and competitive use of the land." His entire address was an apt example of how well the international seminar conveyed the worth of the national park idea and also communicated the usefulness and success of the seminar in itself.[243]

Representatives to the International Seminars on the Administration of National Parks and Equivalent Reserves (organized from the mid-1960s onwards) were officials responsible for national parks and conservation leaders in their home

[240] Rockefeller Brothers Fund Grant, Expense Itemization, 25 September 1974, Folder 3362: "Michigan, University of - Ninth International Seminar - on the Administration of International Parks & - Equivalent Reserves, 1974–1976", Box 561, Record Group 3: Projects (Grants); Series 1: Projects (Grants), Rockefeller Brothers Fund records (FA005), RAC.

[241] William S. Moody, RBF, to Mr. Robert C. Milne, United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, 30 January 1975, Folder 3362: "Michigan, University of - Ninth International Seminar - on the Administration of International Parks & - Equivalent Reserves, 1974–1976", Box 561, Record Group 3: Projects (Grants); Series 1: Projects (Grants), Rockefeller Brothers Fund records (FA005), RAC.

[242] Robert C. Milne, Chief, International Park Affairs, to Mr. William S. Moody, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, 27 November 1974, Folder 3362: "Michigan, University of - Ninth International Seminar - on the Administration of International Parks & - Equivalent Reserves, 1974–1976", Box 561, Record Group 3: Projects (Grants); Series 1: Projects (Grants), Rockefeller Brothers Fund records (FA005), RAC.

[243] Speech delivered by Mario Dary R., Representative for Guatemala and Elected President of the Alumni Association of the 9th International Seminar on National Parks and Equivalent Reserves, at the closing meeting, 6 September 1974, Folder 3362: "Michigan, University of - Ninth International Seminar - on the Administration of International Parks & - Equivalent Reserves, 1974–1976", Box 561, Record Group 3: Projects (Grants); Series 1: Projects (Grants), Rockefeller Brothers Fund records (FA005), RAC.

countries—therefore, the seminars were a major platform through which to help develop park ideas and management abroad. The purpose of the seminars was

> to examine policies, administration, planning and other aspects of management of national parks and equivalent reserves … Policies and programs of North American parks are related to those of national parks in other countries and participants are expected to participate fully in the seminar discussions …[244]

These international short courses (International Seminars on the Administration of National Parks and Equivalent Reserves) were important in influencing foreign park systems. For example, park officials from New Zealand were greatly influenced by the American national park system through their participation in the short course in the late 1960s, which then showed in the development of New Zealand's national parks in many ways.[245]

Funding such national park co-operation and development efforts held great potential for positively impacting the participating countries. As J. Downs Herold, Director of Conferences and Institutes at the University of Michigan, mentioned when thanking the Rockefeller Brothers Fund for its support: "I am sure that this investment in Central America's future will be very worthwhile."[246] Funding Latin American representatives for the national park seminars was in line with the RBF's general interest in the area. The Rockefeller Brothers Fund recognized the importance of the training program and the benefits it had had since the mid-1960s, also noting that Latin American countries had only recently taken an interest in participating but that they

[244] "International Seminar on the Administration of National Parks and Equivalent Reserves: Background Information," 6/26/1974, Folder 3362: "Michigan, University of - Ninth International Seminar - on the Administration of International Parks & - Equivalent Reserves, 1974–1976", Box 561, Record Group 3: Projects (Grants); Series 1: Projects (Grants), Rockefeller Brothers Fund records (FA005), RAC.
[245] Theodore Catton, "A Short History of the New Zealand National Park System," in *National Parks Beyond the Nation: Global Perspectives on "America's Best Idea"*, ed. Adrian Howkins, Jared Orsi, and Mark Fiege (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2016), 68–90.
[246] J. Downs Herold, Director of Conferences and Institutes, University of Michigan, to William S. Moody, RBF, 25 September 1974, Folder 3362: "Michigan, University of - Ninth International Seminar - on the Administration of International Parks & - Equivalent Reserves, 1974–1976", Box 561, Record Group 3: Projects (Grants); Series 1: Projects (Grants), Rockefeller Brothers Fund records (FA005), RAC.

lacked the funding to attend the training workshops that would equip them with important land management knowledge:

> Thus, RBF staff believes modest fellowship support here constitutes a significant contribution toward a major new component for the Fund's Latin American program (approved in 1972), now being developed to link the promotion of wise use of forests, watersheds, national parks and wildlife with employment generation in rural areas of Central America.[247]

The providing of funds seemed to be part of a more general interest by the Rockefeller Brothers Fund in Latin America rather than a special interest in national parks as such. In the 1970s, for instance, the Fund supported a large project on wildlands management in Latin America.[248] However, it was unable to support the travel of foreign participants for the 1976 seminar "due to program priorities and limitations."[249]

In the mid-1950s, support was being sought for a wildlife advisor to Southeast Asia, a project relevant to national parks, with the hope that this kind of project would combine the interests of the Rockefellers (John D. Rockefeller, III's interest in Southeast Asia and Laurance S. Rockefeller's interest in conservation) into a single project, as Harold J. Coolidge suggested.[250] However, the application did not succeed, as it was not in line with the Fund's program emphases.[251] The Rockefeller Brothers Fund did, however, also fund some similar sounding projects. In the early 1970s, it supported a wildlife project in East and Central Africa, providing a grant of

[247] Rockefeller Brothers Fund, 9 July 1974, "University of Michigan," Folder 3362: "Michigan, University of - Ninth International Seminar - on the Administration of International Parks & - Equivalent Reserves, 1974–1976", Box 561, Record Group 3: Projects (Grants); Series 1: Projects (Grants), Rockefeller Brothers Fund records (FA005), RAC.
[248] This is too sizable to address here. See Folders 2860–2868 in Boxes 470–471, Record Group 3: Projects (Grants); Series 1: Projects (Grants), Rockefeller Brothers Fund records (FA005), RAC.
[249] William S. Moody memorandum to RBF Files "The University of Michigan International Seminar on National Parks and Equivalent Reserves", 9 August 1976, Folder 3362: "Michigan, University of - Ninth International Seminar - on the Administration of International Parks & - Equivalent Reserves, 1974–1976", Box 561, Record Group 3: Projects (Grants); Series 1: Projects (Grants), Rockefeller Brothers Fund records (FA005), RAC.
[250] Harold J. Coolidge to Mr. John D. Rockefeller, III, 25 January 1956, Folder 2856: "International Union for Conservation of Nature- & Natural Resources, 1955–1969", Box 469, Record Group 3: Projects (Grants); Series 1: Projects (Grants), Rockefeller Brothers Fund records (FA005), RAC.
[251] Robert C. Bates, RBF, to Harold J. Coolidge, Pacific Science Board, National Research Council, 5 April 1956, Folder 2856: "International Union for Conservation of Nature- & Natural Resources, 1955–1969", Box 469, Record Group 3: Projects (Grants); Series 1: Projects (Grants), Rockefeller Brothers Fund records (FA005), RAC.

20,000 dollars to support John S. Owen's activities as a consultant to the IUCN on conservation matters, particularly on national parks. In Africa, Owen surveyed national park problems in Kenya and Uganda, "inquiring into the general political background, the public attitude to national parks, and the organizational status of the parks including the financing and staff position with special reference to foreseeable trends in the future." Owen also spent time in Zambia, Tanzania, and Sudan studying their national parks and the progress being made in conservation work.[252]

All in all, these efforts show the important role foundations played in enabling international conservation meetings and the transfer of park knowledge—which in turn consolidated U.S. leadership in national park matters and the intellectual claim to the invention of the national park idea.

2.3. Exporting the National Park Idea and Promoting American Values: The Case of the African Student Program

Previously in this chapter I examined some international national park programs (such as national park conferences and the short courses for park administrators). I will now turn to a special program organized in the United States for African students as a more focused example of programs aimed at internationals, as my focus for this chapter—the cultural export of national parks as a positive American idea and promoting the narrative of Yellowstone as the birthplace of a worldwide park movement—is particularly present here. I argue that the African student program is a great example of the usefulness of the national park idea as a cultural export since it was used to promote American ideals and give a positive idea of American values. It has also been overlooked in previous studies[253] and has not been connected to the larger endeavor of promoting the national park idea as an American idea.

---

[252] Frank G. Nicholls, Deputy Director General, IUCN, to Mr. James N. Hyde, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, 31 January 1973, Folder 2857: "International Union for Conservation of Nature- & Natural Resources, 1971–1973", Box 469, Record Group 3: Projects (Grants); Series 1: Projects (Grants), Rockefeller Brothers Fund records (FA005), RAC.

[253] The African student program is only briefly mentioned in Young and Dilsaver's short overview of some NPS international activities: Terence Young and Lary M. Dilsaver, "Collecting and Diffusing 'the World's Best Thought': International Cooperation by the National Park Service," *The George Wright Forum* 28, 3 (2011): 269–278.

Promoting conservation and national parks abroad, for example in Africa, cannot be seen merely or perhaps not even primarily as cultural diplomacy. Usually in these cases, the National Park Service seemed to have a genuine concern with and interest in helping conserve nature in other countries—the possibility to shape attitudes and ideas in favor of U.S. culture seemed an added bonus. Therefore, there was a connection between exporting useful conservation knowledge and exporting cultural ideals.

George A. Petrides, Professor of Fisheries and Wildlife, wrote to officials associated with international exchanges in the late 1950s. The National Park Service received copies of his letters, possibly because of their interesting comments related to national parks. Petrides, who had been a Fulbright grantee in Kenya and Uganda in the 1950s and had also traveled to other places in Africa, corresponded with Harry B. Wyman from the International Educational Exchange Service in 1957 regarding Petrides's possible participation in planning exchange programs for the sub-Saharan Africa region. What is most interesting about Petrides's letter is his opinion about the importance and role of national parks. Petrides felt that the U.S. State Department could do something to help countries like Kenya and Uganda to establish and manage national parks. "National parks are an American invention. They are a form of land use which originated in the United States and of which we can be proud," he wrote. "They may be compared with art treasures, libraries, or museums, in the permanence and increasing values they possess," he continued. Petrides suggested "that as a State Department field of interest, national parks should be excellent material with which to cultivate international friendships." In his opinion, national parks "preserve cultural values of both national and international importance for future generations."[254] In his opinion, the great thing about national park co-operation was that no other meanings could be assigned to it:

> Any contribution the United States makes toward national park establishment and maintenance in a foreign nation could hardly be

[254] George A. Petrides, Associate Professor of Fisheries and Wildlife, to Harry B. Wyman, Acting Chief, Program Planning Staff, International Educational Exchange Service, Department of State, Washington D.C., 31 October 1957, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2171, L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1949–61, Pt. 3, NARA.

> considered to be anything other than a cultural and economic contribution. It would be difficult to assign to us an alterior [sic] motive. I wonder if the national park encouragement could not serve as an ideal cultural export of which the United States Information Service and other State Department activities could make more widespread use.[255]

Two years later, in 1959, Petrides wrote on similar matters—this time about exchanges with Sudanese park personnel specifically—to Dr. Francis A. Young of the Committee on the International Exchange of Persons. His letter, which was also sent to NPS Director Wirth, contained many of the same opinions on the park idea, including the notion that "National parks are an American idea." He suggested that in addition to helping African countries, national parks had more uses and benefits to them, and parks could also be used for acquiring international friendships. Co-operation in national park matters could have "beneficial effects also on international affairs," as he put it. Petrides noted of Sudan in particular: "Both their recent independence and their critical position in Africa and Arab world, should make it important that we make friends with key people here."[256]

These materials do not reveal the NPS's stance on this matter, but the correspondence is an excellent window into the argumentation that noted the economic, cultural, and preservationist benefits of national parks to African countries as well as the positive image and associations the United States could gain from international national park co-operation. Promoting conservation and exporting the national park idea as a cultural idea could work together.

Next, I will examine in more detail the African student program, a conservation initiative that is a great example of how the narrative of Yellowstone and national parks in general was used to export the park idea and create a positive impression of the United States as well as to encourage the adoption of the national park idea in Africa. National parks were naturally a good choice when it came to finding

[255] Ibid.
[256] George A. Petrides, Professor of Fisheries and Wildlife, to Dr. Francis A. Young, Executive Secretary, Committee on International Exchange of Persons, Washington D.C., 4 February 1959; George A. Petrides, Professor of Fisheries and Wildlife, to Conrad Wirth, Director, National Park Service, Department of Interior, Washington D.C., 10 February 1959, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2171, L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1949–61, Pt. 3, NARA.

places that would promote wholesome American values. However, a national park as a destination for African students seems a curious fit at first glance, as national parks have traditionally been very white places.

While I am only examining the African student program from the perspective of how it exemplifies the National Park Service's work of promoting the national park idea as a positive, great American idea, some important events and topics occurred at this time that need to be mentioned in connection with nature and race in the 1960s.

The first of these developments, perhaps quite closely connected to the African student program, was the decolonization of Africa after the Second World War. European powers had taken control of the entire continent by the early 20th century—an arrangement that dissolved mostly from the 1950s onwards, as new states received independence from European colonial rule. Decolonization resulted in new nations being formed that would be taking their place on the world scene—and also building their societies (including establishing and taking care of national parks). The Cold War competition between the United States and Soviet Union affected the African continent, as both countries strived to increase their influence in the new African states.[257] Even though it is not possible to examine American cultural diplomacy in Africa in more detail within the confines of this study, it is worth noting that the African student program can certainly be seen as part of U.S. image-building in Africa, even though for the National Park Service it was a program with a conservationist focus and the parks agency did not seem to articulate any direct propaganda purpose for it.

Another important topic is the relationship between not just nature and race, but racial issues in society in general. The *Civil Rights Act* was supported by various groups of the public and was passed the same year as the *Wilderness Act*, in 1964. It was a landmark for fighting against racial discrimination, which was widespread throughout the country. More subtle discrimination included, for example,

[257] For basics on the decolonization of Africa, see James D. Le Sueur (ed.), *The Decolonization Reader* (New York and London: Routledge, 2003); David Birmingham, *The Decolonization of Africa* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 1995); John D. Hargreaves, *Decolonization in Africa* (London and New York: Longman, 1988).

excluding African Americans from the outdoors and from conservation activities, as Carolyn Finney has noted.[258]

Finney argues that American national parks have traditionally been very "white." She suggests that the National Park Service has not traditionally advertised parks to people of color, be it African Americans or Latinos. Finney's own research into African Americans and the environment has investigated how African Americans have been underrepresented and at times even excluded from national parks, other outdoor recreation and nature appreciation possibilities, and environmental matters in general. Both the actual visitor numbers and park brochures advertising national parks and other outdoor recreation areas suggest that national parks were not targeted to African Americans but instead were essentially "white spaces."[259]

In 1961, the National Park Service was "asked to coordinate a very important pilot training project for ten African university students who have been taking graduate work during the past year in American universities," as the National Park Service characterized the program. Students' travel was to be funded by the African-American Institute and the African Wildlife Leadership Foundation (also some State Departments funds were used) and the program would take place in Yellowstone and a few other places nearby.[260] Background material for the program carefully articulated what a necessity such a program was for Africa. The political situation of the continent had resulted in disruptions that threatened wildlife populations. The program aimed at offering potential African leaders of the future a chance to learn "an appreciation for conservation and wildlife management." Furthermore, the program would "demonstrate the intense interest of the American people in wildlife. This will result in the African students accumulating a store of knowledge that can be directly applied to their problems at home."[261] Organizing the program was taken seriously by the National Park

[258] Carolyn Finney, *Black Faces, White Spaces: Reimagining the Relationship of African Americans to the Great Outdoors* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014).
[259] Ibid.
[260] Hillory A. Tolson, Acting Director, memorandum "Visit and Training of African Students" to Superintendents of Badlands, Grand Teton, Wind Cave, and Yellowstone, 21 June 1961, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2171, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1949–61, Pt. 4, NARA.
[261] "Training Project – African Students," RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2171, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1949–61, Pt. 4, NARA.

Service—it was considered important that nothing ruin the experience for the students.[262]

During the summer of 1961, ten students participated in the first African student program, held in Yellowstone National Park and the surrounding area. The program lasted for about two months, from early July to late August, and it consisted of various tours and trips for the first few weeks. After these trips, the participants had more specific work assignments in groups and individually. While the first part of the program familiarized the students with the National Park Service and its functions and offered them tours of nearby areas, the latter part provided them with a chance for more specific hands-on participation in activities. For example, the information about the NPS ranged from the history of the national park idea, to wilderness concepts and conservation policies, to organizational information. Tours were done by bus and boat and included various places of interest, such as Yellowstone Lake, and students were able to observe and participate in NPS operations.

The program was designed to spark an interest in conservation and park issues—which was initially lacking in students, as they were mainly oriented towards engineering and administration. During their individual work assignments, students learned about engineering activities and problems, the work of the Park Historian, campground study, and administrative processes, for example. Participants were assigned to these activities based on their own interests.[263] Interestingly, for one group of students the activities included a trip to "Madison Junction where the story of the original campfire scene was given on the site of the actual event" as part of interpretation training.[264]

---

[262] Hillory A. Tolson, Acting Director, memorandum "Visit and Training of African Students" to Superintendents of Badlands, Grand Teton, Wind Cave, and Yellowstone, 21 June 1961, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2171, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1949–61, Pt. 4, NARA.

[263] For example, Park Ranger Richard L. Holder, Yellowstone National Park, memorandum "African Students' Activities August 14–20" to Superintendent, 21 August 1961; Park Ranger Richard L. Holder, Yellowstone National Park, memorandum "African Students' Activities – July 8 through 19" to Superintendent, 20 July 1961; Oscar T. Dick, Chief Park Ranger, Yellowstone National Park, memorandum "African Student Program – Report July 1–7" to Superintendent, 14 July 1961; "Tentative Program for African Students, July & August 1961," RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2171, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1949–61, Pt. 4, NARA.

[264] Park Ranger Richard L. Holder, Yellowstone National Park, memorandum "African Student Program – July 20–26 (July 20 through July 29 – Mr. Awuku and Oworen" to Superintendent, 1 August 1961, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2171, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1949–61, Pt. 4, NARA.

The 1961 program was organized without an opportunity to plan it carefully, so naturally there were some complaints about the practical arrangements. In evaluating the success of the first program, the Superintendent of Yellowstone articulated many central points and motivations of the African student program. Superintendent Garrison noted that the program "has great merit" and should be continued, as it possessed genuine value. "National Parks have not been given strong recognition on an International scale, especially among the newer nations, so we have here an unparalleled opportunity to accomplish a wholesome objective with all the peoples of the world as benefactors," Garrison noted. He had many ideas on how to improve the program for future years, but there was no question about the importance of the effort: "In summation, we believe strongly in the basic worth of such a program. Only through such endeavor do we have the opportunity not only transmit ideas and philosophies, but also to establish small bits of world wide goodwill, through personal friendships which have arisen." Participants for the first program had been selected without proper screening. Garrison noted that more attention needed to be paid on the selection of students for the program. Many of the students participating in the first program had not initially been interested in national parks, had not been aware of the nature of the program they were participating in, or had lacked basic social skills.[265]

In summing up the benefits of the program and recommending its continuation, Director Wirth noted that it was a great means for showing what the United States was all about. He wrote: "We know of no more effective way of presenting a way of life than to teach others about the conservation and use of natural, historic, and human resources."[266]

Interestingly, these programs took place in the 1960s, when colored people quite likely were virtually nonexistent in American national parks. In the 1960s and 1970s, membership in environmental organizations was largely white and a disproportionate number of visitors to American national parks were educated white

[265] Lemuel A. Garrison, Superintendent of Yellowstone National Park, memorandum "Summary Report, African Student Program, with Recommendations," to Director, National Park Service, 31 August 1961, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2171, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1949–61, Pt. 4, NARA.

[266] Conrad L. Wirth, Director, National Park Service, memorandum "Summary Report and Recommendations – African Student Program" to Assistant Secretary, Public Land Management, 10 October 1961, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2171, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1949–61, Pt. 4, NARA.

people.[267] Finney notes that in the studies conducted by the National Park Service, visitor numbers for African Americans have been the lowest of all ethnic groups. There is also a notable lack of diversity in park employment and hiring practices.[268] North of the border, in Canada, even Martin Luther King was refused entry to Fundy National Park. Alan MacEachern writes that King's friend, Professor Harold DeWolf, his wife, and Dr. and Mrs. King had made plans to vacation at Fundy National Park in New Brunswick, Canada, in the summer of 1960. Professor DeWolf wrote to the park in advance to make sure it was okay to bring their friends, "a fine Negro minister and his wife." He received a reply from the bungalow owner at Fundy, who thought it was best if their black friends did not come along, since other American guests at the Canadian park might object. In the end, the DeWolfs traveled to their vacation destination without the Kings.[269]

Frank Masland Jr was one individual outside of the NPS who took great interest in the African student program. Many of his opinions on the value of the program might have reflected the park authorities' thinking as well. Masland thought that showcasing parks to foreign visitors would help in presenting the best possible image of the U.S. by making visitors realize "that America possesses a soul."[270] According to him, the African student program would be a great tool for American cultural diplomacy—one that would not necessarily even be understood as propaganda. Masland thought it was very important for the Park Service to undertake a program like the African student program so that "the Park Service could do its bit through this medium to help create the kind of an image it is so necessary we possess throughout the world—even where the curtain has dropped."[271] Masland thought the program would be excellent in aiding the relationship between the U.S. and the countries represented by the participants:

---

[267] Finney, *Black Faces*, 25–26; Alan MacEachern, *Natural Selections: National Parks in Atlantic Canada, 1935–1970* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001), 165.
[268] Finney, *Black Faces*, 26–27.
[269] MacEachern, *Natural Selections*, 165–169.
[270] F. E. Masland, Jr., Carlisle, Pennsylvania, to Dr. Conrad Wirth, Director, National Park Service, Dept. of the Interior, 11 December 1961, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2171, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1949–61, Pt. 4, NARA.
[271] Frank Masland to Dr. George C. Ruhle, Office of International Affairs, National Park Service, Dept. of the Interior, 3 August 1961, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2171, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1949–61, Pt. 4, NARA.

> Students from these relatively underdeveloped lands for some strange reason resent Western propaganda more than they do Soviet propaganda. Perhaps we handle it more clumsily.
>
> A "National Park Service Foreign Student Summer Program" providing opportunities for students to visit our parks and become intimately acquainted with the manner in which they function, but more importantly, the purpose for which they exist would not be resented even by those most allergic to propaganda.[272]

African students seemed like a particularly good group for a program of this kind. Masland had "observed that all too often foreign students, especially those from Africa, complete their college work and leave for their home country not only unconvinced of the values inherent in the American way of life but often violently antipathetic." This, Masland thought, resulted from a lack of opportunities for these students during their stay in the United States, which gave them a narrow view of the country and its ideals. National parks—along with industrial areas—were ideal destinations for these students as they gave a different view of the U.S. than did metropolitan areas, with national parks highlighting the American "appreciation of the spiritual." Masland considered seeing national parks to be of great significance for these students, since "above all else these students should return to their native country convinced that America does attach the utmost importance to spiritual values." Masland's thoughts, then, differed somewhat from those of the NPS, as he himself noted; the NPS referred to the economic value of national parks in promoting the program, which Masland thought of as secondary importance, "a by-product of spiritual values." If African students became "thoroughly acquainted with our National Parks System," they would become "as a result, equally convinced of the basic soundness of the American ideology."[273] Through the program, African students would see a different, better side of America.

---

[272] Ibid.

[273] F. E. Masland, Jr., Carlisle, Pennsylvania, to Mr. L. F. Cook, Chief of Ranger Activities, National Park Service, Dept. of the Interior, 21 July 1961, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2171, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1949–61, Pt. 4, NARA.

Masland was also interested in whether it was possible to know "what convictions they carried back to Africa with them." His interest stemmed from an interest in both the NPS as well as the education of foreign students.[274] Larry Cook from the NPS wrote back to Masland, suggesting that the future success of the program "is difficult to determine at this stage." He noted: "It may be years before real values are evident. We have learned a lot already about foreign training but undoubtedly a lot more will come from this project."[275]

Authorities had been evaluating the possible impact of the program on participants from the beginning. Park ranger Richard L. Holder provided his observations about the personalities of the participants and how they felt about the value of the program. Participants had not initially been greatly interested in national parks; rather, "we have had to generate an interest, besides the presentation of cold facts." In characterizing the participants, his comments included mentions of the motivation level of the students. Zacchaeus Okurounmu "creates the impression that he considers the entire program a waste of his valuable time," while Martin A. Oworen was "generally quite interested in NPS as it fits into the field of Public Administration." Aleck Chemponda was "very interested in the natural features of the area and in the preservation idea." Holder thought Abose Damassa's "interest in NPS affairs is very good and […] I predict that Abose will be heard from in future years." Regarding his interest in the program, Holder noted that Damassa's "field of economics is his burning thought and desire and any way that Parks will fit into his country's economy will be his 'meat'." Christian Ohiri was rated "the best of the group." Holder thought Ohiri "feels that this experience is one of the finest of his life."[276]

The program was continued after the initial program in 1961. Participants in the first program had been selected without proper screening, which created some problems. From 1962 onwards, more attention was paid to the selection of students. In

[274] F. E. Masland, Jr., Carlisle, Pennsylvania, to Mr. Larry Cook, National Park Service, Dept. of the Interior, 14 July 1961, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2171, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1949–61, Pt. 4, NARA.
[275] L. F. Cook, Chief of Ranger Activities, to Mr. Frank E. Masland, Jr., Carlisle, Pennsylvania, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2171, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1949–61, Pt. 4, NARA.
[276] Park Ranger Richard L. Holder, Yellowstone National Park, memorandum "African Students' Activities – July 8 through 19" to Superintendent, 20 July 1961, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2171, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1949–61, Pt. 4, NARA.

1962, Assistant Director Daniel B. Beard noted the basics of the selection process for the students:

> The students selected for the program are interested in diverse fields generally other than those involving parks, wildlife, and conservation. They give promise of becoming leaders of thought and action in their respective countries. The purpose of this summer program is to acquaint them with the values, usage, and importance of National Parks and related conservation projects.[277]

It seems, indeed, that students were impressed with the program and that it was useful for the international promotion of the national park idea. Student letters from 1962 evaluated the program and its benefits and clearly show that the summer spent learning about national parks had made a lasting impression on them. It is important, however, to keep in mind that the opinions of these students should not be examined without considering their context. Participants likely aimed their words at American hosts who had enabled their participation in the program in the first place. Letters containing feedback on the program were probably expected to be polite and report what the Americans supposedly wanted to hear—therefore, the students probably were not completely frank in their opinions. Still, the letters of African students offer valuable insight into what was transmitted—or expected to be transmitted—through the program.

Irabo Uzebu from Nigeria noted the kindness of Mr. Derry Coe, who had been with the group for their entire time in Yellowstone National Park. Mr. Uzebu thought that this NPS employee's friendly behavior had contributed to the good relations between the U.S. and Africa. Uzebu seemed convinced of the worthwhileness of the program and the image it had given him of the United States.[278] Some students, like Alois M. Bera, found most value in practical and technical matters, such as irrigation projects: "For some selfish reasons, I valued my experience on reclamation

[277] Daniel B. Beard, Assistant Director, memorandum "African Student Program, Visit to Zion National Park August 2 – 4," to Superintendent, Zion, 25 July 1962, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2172, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1961–69, Pt. 1, NARA.
[278] "African Students' Summer Program," 1962, Irabo Uzebu of Nigeria, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2172, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1961–69, Pt. 1, NARA.

amongst the most profitable on this tour."[279] Many students, however, mentioned ideological transformations and new insights as the most profound results gained from the program. Zamba Liberty summed up the value of parks as follows: "There is much which can be said about these natural reservations. But the four words which explains its meaning most to me are its relative importance to the society, its objectivity, its value, and its universality." Liberty continued that he was "quite amazed at the importance attached to an area where there was some awkward make-up in the earth's physique. Why would people make such a fuss about these things?" He had, however, "found the answer at Yellowstone" and seemed thoroughly impressed and absorbed by what he had seen while touring the American national parks.[280] The narrative of Yellowstone's creation was present as well:

> During my stay in Madison Junction, I listened to historian of the Yellowstone National Park explain the founding of this country's national park system. In his explanation he narrated how the Expedition of 1872 refused to capitalize on their discovery and instead offered it as a place which will be used for the benefit of all the people.[281]

Liberty had understood that the value of national parks could not be measured in dollars. "If there be anything that I have gained while on this tour, it has been the ability to appreciate nature," he acknowledged. By meeting some of the attendees of the First World Conference on National Parks, which was organized in the U.S. in 1962, Liberty had become convinced that the national park idea was "a worldwide idea" and that the existence of national parks greatly contributed to world peace. "To visitors who come to see the wonders of the United States, I would advise them to see its national parks, its true nature," Liberty noted.[282] This suggests that the African student program had been successful in showing the American way of life and the country's true character through

[279] "Our Summer Experience," 1962, Alois M. Bera, Southern Rhodesia, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2172, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1961–69, Pt. 1, NARA.
[280] "An Analyzation of the African Students Summer Vacation Program with the National Park Service," 1962, Zamba Liberty, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2172, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1961–69, Pt. 1, NARA.
[281] Ibid.
[282] Ibid.

visits to national parks. Students could now see America's "true nature," as noted in their letters.

Morefe Obele, a Nigerian student, had learned a great deal of useful information and was sure that the lessons learned in the U.S. national parks would help the situation in Africa. For example, he cautioned against repeating American mistakes in Africa. In this task, students who had participated in the program would be in a key position: "Not all of us in this program will be conservationists professionally, but we shall certainly support the preservation of our wildlife for the benefit of posterity."[283] A Kenyan participant noted that the composition of the group, which included students from different educational backgrounds, such as political science, history and government, engineering, law, and conservation, had been very useful for discussions about African futures. He was convinced that the program was very useful for Africa—a continent that needed to invest in caring for its natural heritage—and called the program "a tremendous success."[284]

This had indeed been the goal of the program. The program was continued at least throughout the 1960s. The purpose of the program was to show future African leaders the value of conservation—therefore, it was not directly aimed at conservationists, but at those who could influence opinions in their home countries. Later it was noted, however, that including some students from conservation fields in the group might be beneficial for group discussions.[285] In the late 1960s, a rather grandiosely worded letter was sent to those selected to the program. It noted:

> You have been selected to participate in the African Student Program because you have shown qualifications as a potential leader. Experience with American conservation programs and problems will provide you with

[283] "National Parks Summer Program, 1962," Morefe Obele, Nigeria, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2172, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1961–69, Pt. 1, NARA.
[284] "African Students Summer Program – 1962," Perez Malande Olindo, Kenya, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2172, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1961–69, Pt. 1, NARA.
[285] "Proposed Program, African Student Program, 1963;" A. C. Stratton, Acting Director, National Park Service, memorandum "Report on African Student Training Program, 1965" to Director, Resources Program Staff, 26 October 1965, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2172, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1961–69, Pt. 1, NARA.

> a foundation that should enable you to use your influence to encourage wise resource practices in your own country when you return home.[286]

The goals of the African student program were twofold: the program sought to give a good image of the United States abroad, but the main purpose was also to prepare Africans to protect African nature. Since many of the students participating in the program had little to no experience in conservation work, nor was it a requirement, it is clear that what was being transferred through the program was ideological change and new ideas (and only then came the more practical skills learned in the short summer program). As spelled out by the NPS, the program wanted to reach the future leaders of Africa and influence their ideas.

The African student program is an excellent illustration of how the national park as American intellectual property was used not only with the hope to better the situation in Africa in the future but also to give a good impression of the U.S. abroad. This furthermore highlights the importance of understanding national parks as places that are about much more than nature: along with exporting knowledge of park management, other ideals and goals could be advanced at the same time. This work of exporting the park idea also benefited from the existing narrative of the creation of Yellowstone National Park, as it provided an easily understandable and inspiring story for the African students.

The African student program and its promotion of the American park idea is also very significant because it shows that even though African Americans were not the targeted audience of American national parks, the national park idea was such a useful export that it was still marketed to African students to give them a deeper and more favorable image of the United States and inspire them to promote the park idea in their home countries. In a sense, the "whiteness" of national parks was put aside and they were crafted to be parks for everyone, with the national park being a universally desirable idea—despite the fact that African students likely encountered very few people of color during their stay in American parks.

[286] "To the African Student Program Participants," RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2172, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Africa, 1961–69, Pt. 1, NARA.

Chapter 3

Narrating American Wilderness: The Special Relationship to Nature and National Parks in the United States

National parks can be seen as "manufactured natures," "storied wilderness," and transnational stories. The tale of the Madison Junction campfire was an important component in selling the park idea and grounding it as an American idea. This chapter looks at the ways in which the story of the national park idea as an American idea was constructed, reinforced and transmitted, and how it could have been challenged. My focus is specifically on this narrative and its articulation. The following chapter—chapter 4 of this study—will examine one example of the adoption of this narrative.

The first part of the chapter surveys the development of the national park system in the U.S. in the 1960s and 1970s, particularly noting the growing emphasis on wilderness—highlighted by the *Wilderness Act* of 1964—and discusses the American relationship to wilderness more broadly. The appreciation for wilderness was argued to be a distinctly American characteristic. Many Americans saw the national park idea as a great American idea, one which should be promoted, and they wrote to the National Park Service with suggestions. One good example of the pervasiveness of this thinking that national parks were American intellectual property were the suggestions sent to the NPS by regular Americans proposing that Galapagos islands should be made into a national park. That people thought to propose that the U.S. National Park Service take actions in an area belonging to another country is a telling example of the extent to which people considered the national park idea to be an *American* idea. Scholarly writings also participated in constructing the park idea as an American idea, and some well-known scholars, such as Professor Roderick Nash, were even directly in contact with the National Park Service on international park matters.

Secondly, I examine the traditional account of the Madison Junction campfire and the debate this treasured story was subjected to before the Yellowstone

Centennial celebrations of 1972. This exemplifies what an important account the traditional narrative was and how centrally it was still used in promoting the national park idea. Finally, the chapter takes a comparative look at Canada to make a point about the unique interest Americans had for the international promotion of the national park idea.

The chapter draws the conclusion that the national park idea was very much related to the general idea about the perceived special relationship of Americans and wilderness and that the American origin of the national park idea was a carefully constructed story that was important to maintain. To further strengthen the argument that the national park idea was constructed as an American idea, I examine some examples of Canadian international park work, which show that while Canadians were active in international co-operation, the ideological or cultural diplomacy side of international park work was in no way as important for them as it was for the United States.

3.1. National Parks, Wilderness, and the American Mind

It is no wonder that national parks were argued to be a special American contribution during the Cold War, if we also look at how wilderness and the national character were intertwined, be it in scholarly writings about Americans and wilderness or in the actual development of the national park system with growing emphasis on wilderness in the 1960s.

The close connection between national parks and wilderness preservation is much younger than the national park idea. National parks and wilderness were not always necessarily very closely related. Even though today Yellowstone is hailed as the beginning of wilderness preservation, preserving wilderness was not the major concern or reason for creating the park. Although Yellowstone National Park was large in size, its creation was not motivated primarily by wilderness preservation. The area was preserved from private developmental interests, and natural curiosities such as geysers were more important to park creation than preserving the area's ecological system. The bill creating Yellowstone National Park passed easily, as there were no prospects to utilize the area for agriculture, mineral, or timber extraction. Tourism focusing on the

natural curiosities of the area became an early priority for Yellowstone National Park. Wilderness preservation became important only later.[287]

One interesting element is the connection between park wilderness and roads—and how central this connection was for the modern wilderness movement, with roadlessness becoming a defining feature of wilderness. The decades between the 1910s and 1930s gave rise to an increasing number of automobiles in national parks. Masses of automobile tourists flocked to national parks and other conservation areas, while at the same time many new scenic roads were constructed to make such travel possible. These developments led to the creation of the Wilderness Society in 1935, as several important American conservationists became increasingly worried about preserving wilderness. These wilderness activists feared the impact of roads and automobiles on wild areas. However, in national parks the importance of motor tourism continued and even expanded in the post-war years. National parks constituted "windshield wilderness," easily consumed from the comfort of one's automobile. Roads and the needs of automobile tourists influenced the creation and design of national parks. In the 1960s and 1970s, more and more attention was being paid to the growing demand for roadless wilderness recreation as opposed to scenic automobile tourism.[288]

The dual mandate of preservation and use entailed preserving the natural conditions of national parks, but also developing parks for tourism and recreational purposes.[289] During the immediate post-war years, park tourism grew and there was heavy emphasis on recreation, before a turn to environmental concerns and increasing wilderness preservation efforts in the 1960s. In the post-war years, federal funding for the national park system did not keep up with the rising popularity of parks. To better meet the demands of growing visitor numbers, the Mission 66 plan was launched in

---

[287] Karen Jones, "Unpacking Yellowstone: The American National Park in Global Perspective," in *Civilizing Nature: National Parks in Global Historical Perspective*, ed. Bernhard Gissibl, Sabine Höhler, and Patrick Kupper (New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2012), 37; Roderick Nash, *Wilderness and the American Mind*, 4th ed. (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001 [1967]), 108–116.

[288] Paul S. Sutter, *Driven Wild: How the Fight against Automobiles Launched the Modern Wilderness Movement* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2002); David Louter, *Windshield Wilderness: Cars, Roads, and Nature in Washington's National Parks* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2006).

[289] There are numerous studies on the park system that illustrate the different purposes and uses of national parks. See, for example, Richard West Sellars, *Preserving Nature in the National Parks: A History* (New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1997); Mark Daniel Barringer, *Selling Yellowstone: Capitalism and the Construction of Nature* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2002); James A. Pritchard, *Preserving Yellowstone's Natural Conditions: Science and the Perception of Nature* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1999).

1956. It ultimately led to heavy development of park facilities and, at times, infringement on park landscapes. Mission 66, with its developmental focus, raised concerns about the role of preservation in national parks and created pressure for the NPS to be more mindful of ecological preservation. The well-known 1963 Leopold Report was an important document in redirecting the national park system towards ecological preservation.[290]

This growing emphasis on wilderness preservation and restricting development led to the 1964 *Wilderness Act*, which defined wilderness as an area "untrammeled by man," and noted that roadless areas within national parks were to be reviewed for their suitability for preservation as wilderness.[291] For national parks in the following years, this often meant zoning the parks so that certain areas remained beyond the reach of roads—some areas were designated wilderness, some transition zones, and some mainly recreational areas.[292] It is important to remember that the National Park Service has not always been favorable towards wilderness preservation efforts on its lands; for example, it did not support the *Wilderness Act*, as the agency had its own views on park management. Wilderness and national parks do not always overlap and have not had an easy, straightforward relationship.

Wilderness has remained a central influence in American environmental politics after the passing of the *Wilderness Act*. For instance, it has been argued in support of conservation measures in Alaska that this was the last chance to preserve a large wilderness area.[293]

This attention to wilderness in national parks and the role of national parks in general fits the growth of environmental attitudes in the U.S. in the 1960s. This is highlighted by many iconic activities, such as the publication of biologist Rachel Carson's *Silent Spring* in 1962, which alerted the public to the dangers of pesticides, DDT in particular, and sparked the modern environmental movement. The 1960s saw

[290] "Advisory Board on Wildlife Management Appointed by Secretary of the Interior Udall, A. S. Leopold (Chairman), S. A. Cain, C. M. Cottam, I. N. Gabrielson, T. L. Kimball, March 4, 1963, Wildlife Management in the National Parks," in Lary M. Dilsaver (ed.), *America's National Park System: The Critical Documents* (Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1994), 237.
[291] "An Act to Establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the Permanent Good of the Whole People, and for Other Purposes, 1964 (78 Stat. 890)," in Dilsaver, *America's National Park System*, 278–280, quote from p. 278. For more on the *Wilderness Act*, see Mark Harvey, *Wilderness Forever: Howard Zahniser and the Path to the Wilderness Act* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2007).
[292] See, for example, Louter, *Windshield Wilderness*, 134–138.
[293] James Morton Turner, *The Promise of Wilderness: American Environmental Politics since 1964* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2012).

the passing of many important environmental laws in the United States, culminating in the *National Environmental Policy Act* of 1969, which ordered federal agencies—such as the National Park Service—to avoid or reduce environmental degradation. In 1964, Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall reconfirmed the new priorities of park management that were guided by the recommendations of the Leopold Report.[294]

The United States was not alone in this development towards more emphasis on wilderness preservation in national parks. Canadian national park history progressed along the same lines, with heavy interest being placed first on the development of recreational facilities during the post-war increase in visitor numbers. More attention was placed on preservationist viewpoints only later.[295] The 1960s were an important decade for Canadian national parks as well, with the passage of the new national parks policy in 1964, which limited tourist development in national parks, with only activities closely related to nature being subsequently encouraged in national parks. In the 1960s, Canadian members of parliament, who during the 1940s and 1950s had viewed national parks as mainly tourist attractions, began viewing them more and more as wilderness areas that were meant to preserve nature. However, in the minds of many preserving nature was important mainly for retaining the recreational value of nature to visitors and for the monetary benefits it brought—not for the intrinsic value of wilderness as such.[296]

Concern for wilderness preservation (and the active environmental organizations supporting it) emerged in Canada later than in the United States, perhaps due to the different settlement histories of the countries: Canada has not been as concerned about vanishing wilderness as the United States because Canada has more of it left.[297] Historically, wilderness as an idea and ideal has perhaps been more important to the United States than Canada. Donald Worster notes that wilderness has been "a

[294] Dilsaver, *America's National Park System*, 269–276.
[295] Claire Elizabeth Campbell (ed.), *A Century of Parks Canada 1911–2011* (Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2011); Alan MacEachern, *Natural Selections: National Parks in Atlantic Canada, 1935–1970* (Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001); Paul Kopas, *Taking the Air: Ideas and Change in Canada's National Parks* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2007).
[296] Paula Saari, "Selling the Scenery or Preserving the Wilderness: Canadian Members of Parliament and Their Views on the Purpose of National Parks, 1945–64," *International Journal of Canadian Studies* 49 (2014): 253–284.
[297] Saari, "Selling the Scenery," 273–275.

vital part of the American dream of freedom." He argues that "Canadians … have not felt about wilderness quite the same way Americans have."[298]

Even if there were such general national differences, American and Canadian park systems developed for the most part along similar lines and, as noted earlier, in close co-operation with one another. Despite this, wilderness appreciation as a special American trait seemed to affect park philosophy as well, with Americans considering the national park essentially an American invention.

The special role of wilderness in American culture was linked to the inferiority Americans felt towards European cultural civilization. Americans realized their rugged wilderness landscapes could be a source of national pride that compared favorably to the signs of old European cultural civilization. The United States might not have the ruins of the Old World, but its majestic wilderness landscapes could be apt replacement for man-made monuments.[299] As the noted park historian Alfred Runte explains the matter:

> When national parks were first established, protection of the "environment" as now defined was the least of preservationists' aims. Rather America's incentive for the national park idea lay in the persistence of a painfully felt desire for time-honored traditions in the United States. For decades the nation had suffered the embarrassment of a dearth of recognized cultural achievements. Unlike established, European countries, which traced their origins far back into antiquity, the United States lacked a long artistic and literary heritage. The absence of reminders of the human past, including castles, ancient ruins, and cathedrals on the landscape, further alienated American intellectuals from a cultural identity.[300]

[298] Donald Worster, "Wild, Tame, and Free: Comparing Canadian and U.S. Views of Nature," in *Parallel Destinies: Canadian-American Relations West of the Rockies*, ed. John M. Findlay and Ken S. Coates (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2002), 246–273, quotes from p. 250, 252.
[299] Nash, *Wilderness and the American Mind*, 67–83; Alfred Runte, *National Parks: The American Experience*, 2nd, rev. ed. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1987 [1979]), 11–32.
[300] Runte, *National Parks*, 11.

Wilderness was something that 19th-century Americans could embrace as their unique asset and a replacement for old European man-made monuments. This showed in literature and art as well. Along with nationalism, romanticism and transcendentalism were connected to the American appreciation of wilderness. Writers like Henry David Thoreau and Ralph Waldo Emerson and landscape painters such as Thomas Cole, Asher B. Durand, Albert Bierstadt, and Thomas Moran depicted American wilderness and consolidated its importance to American identity.

Wilderness has been a central interest in American environmental history and considerable attention has been paid to wilderness as a historical and cultural construct. Perhaps the most influential scholarly piece on wilderness is William Cronon's classic essay on the problematic concept of wilderness, "The Trouble with Wilderness; or, Getting Back to the Wrong Nature," published in the mid-1990s. In it, Cronon addresses the cultural construction of wilderness, highlighting how it mirrors American culture, and the problems that arise from only thinking of large tracts of natural areas when we think of wilderness. Cronon suggests we should see wilderness in connection with human culture, not as an antidote to it.[301]

Cronon's wilderness essay created a great deal of discussion on the matter, including a special issue of *Environmental History*, the premier journal in the field, which reprinted Cronon's piece in its January 1996 issue, along with critical commentaries from scholars, and a response from Cronon himself.[302] Interest in the wilderness idea also sparked an extensive collection of texts, *The Great New Wilderness Debate*, which discussed wilderness from various points of view, including texts from conservationists, writers, scholars, and activists.[303] Some activists have, for example, argued that talking about wilderness as a cultural construct obscures attention to environmental problems.[304]

---

[301] William Cronon, "The Trouble with Wilderness; or, Getting Back to the Wrong Nature," in *Uncommon Ground: Toward Reinventing Nature*, ed. William Cronon (New York: Norton, 1995), 69–90.
[302] *Environmental History* 1, 1 (January 1996).
[303] J. Baird Callicott and Michael P. Nelson (eds.), *The Great New Wilderness Debate* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1998); J. Baird Callicott and Michael P. Nelson (eds.), *The Wilderness Debate Rages on: Continuing the Great New Wilderness Debate* (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008). On the importance of wilderness in American history, see also Michael Lewis (ed.), *American Wilderness: A New History* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2007).
[304] Dave Foreman, "Wilderness Areas for Real," in *The Great New Wilderness Debate*, ed. J. Baird Callicott and Michael P. Nelson (Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1998): 395–407.

One wilderness scholar and an early pioneer in the field of environmental history, Roderick Nash, is particularly interesting for this study because he was in contact with the National Park Service and participated in describing the national park idea as an American idea. In his 1967 classic, *Wilderness and the American Mind*, Nash connected American national character and the wilderness idea and examined the American relationship to wilderness, from settler struggles with wilderness to sadness at its disappearance.[305] Nash's work connected very well with the general ethos of park officials at the time by highlighting the unique relationship between Americans and wilderness appreciation. He also wrote specifically on the national park idea as an exceptional American invention.

Nash, a professor of history at the University of California, Santa Barbara, wrote to the National Park Service in 1968 as he was "preparing a paper to read before a national convention of historians on American leadership in national parks—both as concept and actuality." Nash sought information "on the relations of our NPS with parks people in other countries." He was particularly interested in hearing about short courses on the administration of national parks as well as receiving statistical information about National Park Service employees sent abroad to advise other countries on park matters and about those foreign officials who had arrived to the U.S. in order to learn about park management. Nash wished to be put on a mailing list in order to receive future publications and other information on NPS activities.[306] The National Park Service supplied Nash with publications on park administration and wrote a lengthy reply to his questions, including mentions of, for example, National Park Service support for park projects in Jordan, Turkey, and Tanzania as well as co-operation with Kenya and Australia, not to mention its extensive links with Canada.[307]

Nash's 1970 article "The American Invention of National Parks" focused largely on the history of the national park idea, with only brief mentions of the international work of the NPS in the 1960s. A copy of Nash's article was also included in the Centennial Commission's files for the preparation of the Yellowstone

[305] Nash, *Wilderness and the American Mind*.
[306] Roderick Nash, Professor of History, University of California, Santa Barbara, to Mr. Theodore Swem, Assistant Director, National Park Service, 10 November 1968, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2170, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Washington Office, 1964–69, NARA.
[307] Theodor R. Swem, Assistant Director, National Park Service, to Professor Roderick Nash, 5 December 1968, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2170, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Washington Office, 1964–69, NARA.

Centennial.[308] Surely park authorities happily welcomed an academic view on the Americanness of the park idea.

In "The American Invention of National Parks,"[309] Nash identified the national park idea as one of the great contributions to humankind. He mentioned the establishment of Yellowstone National Park in March 1872 and its influence:

> Since then *we have exported the national park idea around the world*. We are known and admired for it, fittingly, because the concept of a national park reflects some of the central values and experiences in American culture.[310]

Nash explained the American invention of the national park idea by mentioning a few key factors, firstly "the nation's unique experience with nature in general and wilderness in particular," followed by its democratic ideology, the availability of undeveloped land, and the affluence to afford preserving nature. Nash connected the American appreciation of wilderness with the establishment of national parks: "The special American relationship to wilderness—having it, being shaped by it and then almost eliminating it—soon provided the strongest reasons for appreciating Yellowstone and the subsequent national parks." He also mentioned the country's "democratic tradition" as an important aspect of the birth of the park idea in the U.S. and not in another country.[311] Nash argued that even Russia was following the American park idea: "Russia, like Canada, on the other hand, has a huge northcountry wilderness and is currently following (without acknowledgment) the American lead in national park creation."[312] He ended his article by giving examples of the American influence on park creation in other countries as well as of NPS programs for foreign park officials.

---

[308] Copy of the article Roderick Nash, "The American Invention of National Parks," RG 79, National Parks Centennial Commission, General Files, 1970–1973, Box 1, File: Bulletins, Directives, Press Releases, NARA.
[309] Roderick Nash, "The American Invention of National Parks," *American Quarterly* 22, 3 (Autumn 1970): 726–735.
[310] Ibid., 726. Italics mine.
[311] Ibid., quotes from 726 and 731.
[312] Ibid., 733.

In this way, academic studies participated in the making of the park idea as America's best idea during the Cold War. While Roderick Nash's studies provide useful basic information about park history (even though more critical recent accounts are available), they are perhaps most useful when examined as a primary source of their time, as they show how scholarly research and the Park Service's own articulations about the origins of national parks were sometimes closely intertwined.

Popular sentiment, too, seemed to suggest the special relationship of the United States and environmental protection. The national park was an American idea in the minds of many Americans, who were interested in promoting the national park idea as a great, positive example of American cultural values.

The National Park Service would sometimes receive letters from everyday Americans noting that the national park idea was a positive American idea that should be promoted abroad. For example, an American exchange student in Norway enjoyed promoting the park idea and had asked the NPS for park materials to be used when giving talks on the American national park system in Norway. In a 1961 letter to the NPS, he mentioned that it would be good if there was an USIS film on the national park idea available. "I enjoy telling people about our National Park System and the philosophy on which it is built, because it is one of the most positive sides of the American way of life," he wrote.[313]

It seems that the United States and nature preservation were connected in the minds of many, and the United States was expected to lead the way in the global preservation of nature (as is also evident in the other examples provided in the previous chapter). Many Americans expected the National Park Service to do something about the Galapagos Islands, which belonged to Ecuador. For example, Frank Masland, who had expressed interest in many national park matters, suggested to conservation officials that the NPS could create a national park in the Galapagos Islands. His letter to Harold J. Coolidge contained a note to NPS Director Conrad Wirth. Masland speculated that the Islands could be protected under an administering agency, for example the NPS. He wondered about the possibility of Ecuador selling the area ("that is doubtful and the

[313] K. Scott Wood, Fellow, American-Scandinavian Foundation, Oslo, Norway, to Ben N. Thompson, Chief, Division of Recreation Resource Planning, National Park Service, Washington, D.C., 29 November 1961, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2177, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Europe, 1951–61, NARA.

price would probably be fantastic"), but thought that leasing the Islands under a 99-year contract might be possible.[314] Masland described his idea of the best alternative for the Galapagos Islands as follows:

> The National Park Service would create a Park, call it national or whatever it might be decided to call it, but nevertheless, a park, administered pretty much as we administer our National Parks under existing enabling legislation. The flora and fauna would be protected.[315]

Masland had sweeping plans for national parks outside the continental United States and the many economic and preservationist benefits this would bring. Many conservation officials showed an interest in protecting the Galapagos Islands but it seems that the National Park Service did not really consider it as its own responsibility. Masland's suggestions are interesting in that they exemplify how it was expected that the NPS would take the lead in protecting a foreign area—perhaps precisely because the national park was viewed as an American idea.

Some sixth-grade students from Clive School in Des Moines, Iowa, also wrote to authorities, such as Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall and President Lyndon B. Johnson, as "A class in our school has started a campaign to get the Galápagos Islands, which belong to Ecuador, made into an international park," the letter from student Maureen Ogle to Udall noted. She continued: "Since you deal with this sort of thing, I would appreciate it if you would talk this over with other members of your department and with other people of influence."[316] Ogle received a reply from Myron D. Sutton, Acting Chief in the Division of International Affairs, who noted that the National Park Service appreciated her "interest in making the Galapagos Islands into a national park." Sutton explained the actions taken by the Ecuadorian government, UNESCO, and the IUCN to protect the islands. He noted that the protection of the area

[314] Frank Masland to Dr. Harold J. Coolidge, National Academy of Sciences, Washington DC, 10 March 1960, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2170, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Cooperation with Foreign Agencies, America, 1958–63, NARA
[315] Ibid.
[316] Maureen Ogle, Clive School, Des Moines, Iowa, to Stewart Udall, Department of Interior, Washington D.C., 29 March 1965, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2182, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, South America, 1950–69, NARA. See also other correspondence in this file.

was the responsibility of Ecuador, even though the matter generated international interest.[317]

The school children had also included a drawing of the Galapagos Islands as a national park. In the drawing, trees, tortoises, birds, crabs, and other rare fauna and flora pleaded for the area to be made into a park. It read: "Please make us an International Park," "You will make us [plants and animals] HAPPY," "We would keep it clean," "Please," and "We like it here."[318]

Notably, whereas the students had referred to "an international park," the National Park Service had changed the term to read "a national park." Despite this, it is noteworthy that the students thought American officials could have something to do with preserving an area that belonged to Ecuador. As national parks were an American invention, surely American officials had authority to make conservation plans for rest of the world.

3.2. The Importance of the Story of Yellowstone as the World's First National Park

As the standard account of national park beginnings goes—to put it briefly—the idea of national parks was born at a campfire on 19 September 1870, when the members of the Washburn-Doane expedition, most notably Cornelius Hedges and Nathaniel P. Langford, proposed and later lobbied for the creation of a national park in the Yellowstone area with its geysers, mountains, and waterfalls. The national park became a reality only two years later.[319] The main sources for the account were writings by expedition members, the most important and controversial piece being Langford's diary of the expedition, which was published 35 years after the incident. The allure of the mythical story continues to this day. As Karen Jones notes:

[317] Myron D. Sutton, Acting Chief, Division of International Affairs, to Miss Maureen Ogle, Clive School, Des Moines, Iowa, 3 May 1965, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2182, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, South America, 1950–69, NARA.
[318] Drawing, [1965], RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2182, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, South America, 1950–69, NARA.
[319] On the creation of Yellowstone, see for example, Nash, *Wilderness and the American Mind*, 108–116.

> The inception of the national park idea by a group of altruistic Americans around the campfire remains a compelling image to this day. […] Even doubts over the authenticity of the story failed to dampen its lustre. In a speech commemorating Yellowstone's 125-year anniversary, then vice-president Al Gore paid heed to Madison Junction as the 'holy ground' of American wilderness.[320]

In this section, I will argue just how powerful and carefully constructed the narrative of Yellowstone as the birthplace of the national park idea was. Even though park officials questioned the truthfulness of the well-known account of the events of Madison Junction and the role of the Washburn Expedition—which allegedly directly sparked the creation of a national park in the area—the campfire narrative was upheld and reinforced as an important part of international park history.

Creating stories about national parks and constructing national park nature is nothing new. A national park can be "a storied wilderness,"[321] and in representing parks in a certain way, we are constantly "manufacturing," "editing," and "marketing" the nature of national parks.[322] Yellowstone in particular has been culturally constructed by the tourism industry.[323] National park nature itself is embedded with cultural meanings and competing narratives. This can be seen, for example, with Native Americans and the distinct meanings they have given to places within national parks.[324] In addition to understanding the cultural nature of national parks and the cultural narratives related to the actual nature within parks, we need to deconstruct the narrative behind Yellowstone as the birthplace of all national parks in the world. The account of

[320] Jones, "Unpacking Yellowstone," 31.
[321] James Feldman, *A Storied Wilderness: Rewilding the Apostle Islands* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2011).
[322] J. Keri Cronin, *Manufacturing National Park Nature: Photography, Ecology, and the Wilderness Industry of Jasper* (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2011); Yolonda Youngs, "Editing Nature in Grand Canyon National Park Postcards," *Geographical Review* 102, 4 (2012): 486–509; Paula Johanna Saari, "Marketing Nature: The Canadian National Parks Branch and Constructing the Portrayal of National Parks in Promotional Brochures, 1936–1970," *Environment and History* 21, 3 (2015): 401–446.
[323] Mark Daniel Barringer, *Selling Yellowstone: Capitalism and the Construction of Nature* (Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2002).
[324] Mark David Spence, *Dispossessing the Wilderness: Indian Removal and the Making of the National Parks* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Karl Jacoby, *Crimes Against Nature: Squatters, Poachers, Thieves, and the Hidden History of American Conservation* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2001).

Yellowstone's establishment as the world's first national park was an important, concrete narrative that was carefully created and upheld by the National Park Service and others involved in park work. The narrative was retained even though questions persisted about the campfire narrative's truthfulness during the Yellowstone centennial preparations.

This was not the first time that problems with the campfire myth were raised among park officials. The credibility of the campfire story had been questioned already earlier. For example, in the 1930s scholars questioned the account by Langford. In the 1960s and 1970s, the National Park Service historian at Yellowstone National Park, Aubrey Haines, thoroughly researched the matter and had sound reasons to suspect whether the members of the expedition had actually proposed the creation of a national park. This reasonable doubt sparked debate within the National Park Service. The staff at Yellowstone generally accepted Haines's research. Many higher-level officials, including former NPS director Horace Albright, opposed alterations to the campfire myth and rejected Haines's findings.[325]

The National Park Service—as well as park agencies in other countries—have throughout their histories paid careful attention to the ways in which national parks have been portrayed in visitor information leaflets, educational materials, and promotional brochures. Booklets are important in creating national park ideals and powerful in shaping how visitors and the general public view national parks and their meaning. By altering images and text, national park services can articulate different purposes for parks that evolve over times. While park booklets and informational leaflets might seem innocent and unintentional pieces of factual information, they are in fact carefully constructed to reflect the views of society and park departments and to guide how the general public should see these attractions. National parks are also places that reflect national identity, and park promotion has often strengthened the connections between park nature and nation, for example by articulating the benefits of national parks as valuable national assets to all citizens as well as by highlighting the role of national parks in preserving the nation's most unique landscapes and ecological

[325] Paul Schullery and Lee H. Whittlesey, *Myth and History in the Creation of Yellowstone National Park* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2003). Schullery and Whittlesey suggest that while some park officials supported his research, Haines paid a price for publishing research that was critical of the campfire narrative, as it likely negatively affected his career. This serves to underscore the importance of the campfire story.

wonders. Booklets and visitor information leaflets construct the ideal park wilderness that is then transmitted to visitors.[326]

In the midst of preparing for the 1972 World Conference on National Parks—also the centennial of Yellowstone—the National Parks Centennial Commission had to take a stance on the campfire narrative. The credibility of the Langford diary as a source was questioned by park officials, but retaining the famous story was deemed important nonetheless.

The National Parks Centennial Commission was one of the organizational units created to arrange events for the National Parks Centennial. It was responsible for developing "a suitable plan for the commemoration of the 100th Anniversary of the beginning of the worldwide national park movement" as well as for coordinating activities for the Centennial and participating in hosting the World Conference.[327] The National Parks Centennial Commission, established in 1970, was "made up of 4 members of the House, 4 members of the Senate, the Secretary of the Interior, and 6 citizens to be appointed by the President. This Commission will direct the events and programs of the Centennial." The National Parks Centennial Advisory Committee, serving as staff to the Centennial Commission, was chaired by George B. Hartzog, Jr. and consisted of many members, mostly from the National Park Service, among them several former Directors of the National Park Service.[328]

My purpose here, however, is not to dwell on administrative history or list activities surrounding the centennial, but to examine how the national park idea was articulated as an American idea in this work. The work of the Centennial Commission, particularly the background material and the preparation of written material for Yellowstone's centennial, demonstrates just how important the carefully constructed narrative of Yellowstone as the birthplace of the global national park movement was.

"In 1972, the United States will share with the world its celebration of the National Parks Centennial," the background material on the work of the Centennial

[326] I have discussed this practice in more detail in Saari, "Marketing Nature."
[327] Harthon L. Bill, Vice Chairman, National Parks Centennial Programs, memorandum "National Parks Centennial Objectives," to Directorate and All Field Directors, 21 April 1971, RG 79, National Parks Centennial Commission, General Files, 1970–1973, Box 1, File: Advisory Committee, General Correspondence, NARA.
[328] Harthon L. Bill, Vice Chairman, National Parks Centennial Programs, memorandum "National Parks Centennial Objectives," to Directorate and All Field Directors, 21 April 1971, Attachment 1; Attachment 4, RG 79, National Parks Centennial Commission, General Files, 1970–1973, Box 1, File: Advisory Committee, General Correspondence, NARA.

Commission noted. The establishment of Yellowstone "expressed a new attitude toward the use of natural resources—one that recognizes values going far beyond dollars and cents, by preserving outstanding resources for the common good of all the people." It was noted that "That attitude, those values, and the extraordinary resources of the National Park System are the gifts of the Americans of 1872, and those who followed, to all the world."[329] Yellowstone was not merely a park but "the expression of an Idea, new to the world of that period. It was an Idea with the capacity for expansion and adaptation, and of the gradual realization of fuller meaning both for the American people and for the world."[330] It was as if the park idea had born fully formed then and there and simply spread abroad—which, as I show in chapters 1 and 4, was not the case.

The meaning and importance of the centennial and Yellowstone for Americans was clear, but, according to park officials, the centennial also held a strong importance for the world. Even if the purpose was to "Celebrate the foresight shown by the establishment of Yellowstone, the world's first national park, in 1872," it was not just that. "The Centennial Year of the parks is not simply an occasion for self-congratulation," as other nations joined the U.S. in this celebration, but more generally it was a time for people all around the world to consider the importance of park areas. This was still, however, American intellectual property. "The parks are an institution in which all Americans are justly proud,"[331] the National Parks Centennial Commission emphasized.

Perhaps the most telling example of the importance of Yellowstone's creation narrative and its alleged primacy as the world's first national park was that the account needed to be upheld even if there were problems with it. The National Park Service had begun to stress the long and varied development of the national park idea in its visitor education, rather than firmly grounding it in the Madison Junction campfire discussion as was traditionally done. In a document that was given to Yellowstone's park naturalists and rangers for educating visitors about the park idea it was noted that:

---

[329] Ibid.
[330] Department of the Interior, National Park Service, "1972 National Parks Centennial Objectives, Theme: 1872 – National Parks Centennial Year – 1972," Revised September 1969, RG 79, National Parks Centennial Commission, General Files, 1970–1973, Box 1, File: Advisory Committee, General Correspondence, NARA.
[331] "Draft – 4/8/71," RG 79, National Parks Centennial Commission, General Files, 1970–1973, Box 1, File: Advisory Committee, General Correspondence, NARA.

> The "National Park" idea is often considered to have originated with the Washburn Expedition which explored the Yellowstone wilderness in 1870; yet, such a view does not take into account the long evolutionary development of the concept, both here and abroad.[332]

The National Park Service paper from Yellowstone further noted that the park idea "is an outgrowth of the Anglo-Saxon practice of holding village lands 'in common'." Writers such as Henry David Thoreau and Ralph Waldo Emerson, the Romantic Movement, landscaped cemeteries, Central Park, and the work of Frederick Law Olmstead were all connected to the history of the park idea. Yosemite was mentioned as an important precedent to Yellowstone. All in all, the instructions sought to illustrate that Yellowstone was the result of a long development, that "The 'National Park' idea was not born beside a Yellowstone campfire; it was more complex than that." The Americanness of the idea was not questioned, however. The national park idea "had been a long time forming in the American consciousness, and it was an American concept with its roots in our whole past."[333]

The instructions for Yellowstone park rangers and naturalists frankly noted that "Historical research has uncovered facts indicating that we have been putting undue emphasis on the importance of the role that the Washburn, Langford, Doane Expedition played in the development of the National Park idea."[334] The paper went on to say that:

> In reality there is no reliable evidence to indicate that the idea of setting the Yellowstone country aside as a National Park was ever discussed by the expedition at their famed campsite at the confluence of the Gibbon and Firehole Rivers. Members of the expedition publicized the area by writing several popular articles following their trip; however, these articles extolled the wonders of the country, with no reference to setting it aside as

[332] "The National Park Idea," RG 79, National Parks Centennial Commission, General Files, 1970–1973, Box 1, File: Advisory Committee, General Correspondence, NARA.
[333] Ibid.
[334] Ibid.

> a National Park. Therefore, the importance of their role must be considered primarily as publicity.[335]

All in all, the paper mentioned the need to decrease the role given to this one expedition and to give credit to the expeditions and surveys of the previous years in the NPS's interpretative activities. In conclusion:

> Yellowstone must be shown in its role as a pilot model, as an experiment in land use, whose demonstrated success by 1892 led to the establishment of other national parks in America and the spread of the Park Idea around the world. The climax of the story should, we believe, present some of the outstanding natural values preserved in African, Canadian and lesser known national parks of the world.[336]

This deviation from the standard narrative and attention given to other developments is quite significant, as the traditional account of the Washburn expedition and the story of the great men who proposed to preserve the Yellowstone area for posterity instead of utilizing it for direct economic gain was the backbone of the standard narrative of Yellowstone National Park's establishment as the world's first national park and the birthplace of the park idea that sparked the creation of national parks around the world. It is notable that at Yellowstone National Park, visitors in the early 1970s received information that put the national park idea in its broader context, but that clinging to the "old narrative" of the campfire was still deemed important by others within the Centennial Committee.

Jack Anderson, the Superintendent of Yellowstone, had attached the paper to his letter to Eivind Scoyen, a Centennial Advisory Committee member. "I regret we were not able to discuss our current approach to *the Campfire question* while we were in Washington, but possibly I can clarify it by letter at least to the extent of how we are treating the matter at the present time on site,"[337] it read. Clearly, then, the campfire

[335] Ibid.
[336] Ibid.
[337] Jack [Anderson], National Park Service, Yellowstone National Park, to Mr. E. T. Scoyen, Palo Alto, California, 19 March 1971, RG 79, National Parks Centennial Commission, General Files, 1970–1973, Box 1, File: Advisory Committee, General Correspondence, NARA. Italics mine.

story—"our Campfire story" as it was characterized by Anderson—was an important matter to be singled out. Historians outside of the National Park Service had told Anderson that "Langford's Diary which has been widely circulated was written some 30 years after the Campfire meeting. Apparently the first diary was either lost or burned." They had also "point[ed] out that there is no mention of the Campfire story in any of the other diaries by other members of the party."[338] This, of course, did not mean that the discussion could not have taken place—simply that the lack of evidence called its credibility into question. For this reason, at Yellowstone National Park "we now instruct our interpreters to define the National Park idea as a revolutionary treatment of public lands which had a growth over a substantial period of time."[339] Anderson noted that they were telling the public that the idea of public parks was "an idea that grew over a number of years with refinements being injected to the point of the creation of the first national park."[340] This did not mean at all that Madison Junction was completely forgotten or discredited. The National Park Service still had "a large interpretive sign at Madison Junction identifying the famous Campfire and story related to the campfire as an important factor in the establishment of the Park."[341]

Madison Junction campfire and the almost mythical story of the origin of Yellowstone National Park was an integral part of the construction of the national park idea as an American idea—a story that was familiar, influential, and celebrated abroad as well (we will see in the next chapter how the national park idea was celebrated as an American idea in Finland on the eve of Yellowstone's centennial). The standard account was highly valued within NPS circles, or at least many former high officials who participated in the planning for the centennial held onto it.

Eivind T. Scoyen, Centennial Advisory Committee member and former Associate Director, wrote to Dr. Melville B. Grosvenor, Editor-in-Chief and Chairman of the Board for the National Geographic Society and a member of Centennial Advisory Committee, about the committee meeting discussion that had taken place regarding the campfire and noted that he was of the opinion "that whether this story is true must be

[338] Ibid.
[339] Ibid.
[340] Ibid.
[341] Ibid.

settled before the anniversary year begins."[342] In the letter to Grosvenor, Scoyen commented on his correspondence with Superintendent Anderson:

> I was astonished to find that it has already been decided that the story of the park idea discussion was not credible. [Former NPS Director] Horace Albright is outraged and really on the warpath! *This great tradition relating to our National Parks should not be scrapped until everything possible has been done to confirm it.*[343]

Scoyen's memorandum to Superintendent Anderson made it clear that even if the longer development of the national park idea was considered, the importance of Madison Junction in this narrative should not be discredited. Scoyen noted: "I know of no one who now clings to the notion that the idea originated at the Campfire but whether or not it was discussed there is something entirely different." Scoyen was adamant that it was possible and likely that the national park idea had been discussed by members of the expedition. Scoyen was particularly troubled by the mention in the Yellowstone instructions to rangers and naturalists that there was "no reliable evidence" that the park idea was discussed at the campfire. He wanted to present his evaluation of the topic, which should support modifying the current "official opinion on the subject."[344] "This should result in restoring the Madison Junction to its former position as an enormously important historic site in National Park history and again allow interpreters to tell a wonderful and inspiring story,"[345] he argued.

Scoyen then went on to discuss the credibility of witnesses and that "to impeach testimony you have to impeach the witness" and what constituted direct testimony.[346] He had consulted his son—a judge—on the issue and thoroughly discussed the matter in the memo as if it was a legal case being argued in front of a jury or a full-blown examination of historical evidence. He noted: "it seems logical to

[342] E. T. Scoyen to Dr. Grosvenor, 23 March 1971, RG 79, National Parks Centennial Commission, General Files, 1970–1973, Box 1, File: Advisory Committee, General Correspondence, NARA.
[343] Ibid. Italics mine.
[344] E. T. Scoyen, Member, Centennial Advisory Committee, memorandum to Mr. Jack Anderson, Superintendent, Yellowstone National Park, 23 March 1971, RG 79, National Parks Centennial Commission, General Files, 1970–1973, Box 1, File: Advisory Committee, General Correspondence, NARA.
[345] Ibid.
[346] Ibid.

conclude that unless the historians have come up with very strong and most conclusive evidence impeaching N. P. Langford and Cornelius Hedges their story should be allowed to stand without further controversy."[347] It is not necessary here to follow Scoyen's exact arguments or reference all of his evidence. What is noteworthy is just how seriously and passionately the account of the Madison Junction campfire was regarded and defended. That the origin tale of Yellowstone and the park idea underwent this level of scrutiny is a telling example of its importance—this was a narrative supported and cherished by many, but one being questioned by others.

Scoyen accepted that the park idea "was not born at the time mentioned." He did not, however, accept any effort at discrediting the Madison Junction campfire story or the suggestion that the creation of the park idea had a longer, more complex history, as suggested by Anderson and the Yellowstone instructions for park rangers and naturalists. Scoyen wrote:

> There was nothing complex about the matter at all. The park exploded into being as a result of the intense interest generated throughout the country by the reports of the sensational discoveries of the Washburn-Langford-Doane expedition. I have never seen the slightest evidence that this historic legislation was initiated and guided by a historian who had researched the subject of park development or anyone who had all these facts at his command. I am sure that the group of Montana pioneers who had agreed around a Campfire "To unite our efforts to this end" and later set things in motion to accomplish this, knew little if anything about "**** the long evolutionary development of the concept both here and abroad."[348]

The whole account of the Madison Junction campfire—and the concern about validating its credibility—was less about determining the actual role of the campfire in bringing about the national park idea than it was about preserving and celebrating an inspiring story so central to Yellowstone history and the idea of parks as a great American idea, born in the West through the work of these men with the foresight to suggest preserving

[347] Ibid.
[348] Ibid.

the area for posterity. "The campfire and the discussion which took place there is a great story and one of the significant events of National Park History," Scoyen wrote. "It is an old and revered tradition firmly believed by thousands of people who have labored over the years in the field of National Parks. It places the birth of the movement towards establishing the first National Park with a wonderful and interesting group of rugged western pioneers," he continued.

Not only was the campfire talk an important tale for Americans, it seems that this story also needed to remain intact because of the international fame of the event. Scoyen noted this himself:

> The National Park Service should strive diligently to impress the people of the world with the features of this story and not downgrade it by burying it in a plethora of historical detail that is interesting but which can be judged to have, at the most, little impact on the action to create the park.[349]

The international promotion of the American park narrative is exactly what American park officials did, even if there were different opinions on the exact role of the Madison Junction campfire within the NPS and centennial planning committees. As noted in the introduction, the campfire account was mentioned in a Finnish book on national park management from 1978, telling something of its international importance. In the 1970s, the famous narrative was clearly there in the minds of foreign park officials, so the allure of the story was international.

In 1972, Madison Junction was still very clearly presented as the birthplace of the national park idea to the conference attendees, with the inspiring campfire talk mentioned. Even if the credibility and the significance of the campfire discussion had been questioned, participants at the 1972 conference were still taken to the Madison Junction site, which was presented to attendees as the birthplace of the park idea:

> Flags of 100 nations whipped in the blustery winds as the international park leaders gathered in the amphitheatre *at Madison Junction*

[349] Ibid.

> *overlooking the campfire site where the national park idea was born exactly 102 years earlier*. The audience shivered in the cold rain, which turned into driving sleet as the rededication ceremonies progressed.[350]
>
> As the high point of the ceremony, Mrs. Nixon, pelted by freezing rain, snow, and small pellets of driving hail, bravely held aloft a large torch, symbolically relighting the historic Yellowstone campfire of September 19, 1870.[351]

All in all, the preparations for the centennial repeatedly stressed certain points. The national park was "A uniquely American idea,"[352] which was prominently noted to have "spread beyond the confines of the park throughout the country and the world," and that "We should all be proud of this record."[353] A National Park Service booklet by Freeman Tilden called *Yellowstone: Flowering of an Idea* and prepared especially for the 1972 centennial painted a magical picture of the world's first national park. "There can be magic in a word. The name 'Yellowstone' has that quality," the pamphlet started. It firmly rooted the national park idea as an American invention that was meaningful for the whole world, suggesting that "As we draw near the 100th anniversary of this pioneer adventure in human culture, it is time to consider what it has meant to our country and to the world."[354] Tilden provided a grand account of the creation and meaning of Yellowstone, also mentioning its international impact:

> Yellowstone children today are spread around the world. There are perhaps 90 nations that have a system of national parks. There are the

---

[350] National Parks Centennial Commission, 1972 Annual Report, page 73, RG 79, National Parks Centennial Commission, General Files, 1970–1973, Box 1, File: Centennial Annual Report, NARA. Italics mine.
[351] National Parks Centennial Commission, 1972 Annual Report, page 75, RG 79, National Parks Centennial Commission, General Files, 1970–1973, Box 1, File: Centennial Annual Report, NARA.
[352] "The National Park Centennial: A Prospectus," RG 79, National Parks Centennial Commission, General Files, 1970–1973, Box 1, File: Advisory Committee, General Correspondence, NARA.
[353] The Secretary of the Interior, memorandum "The Second Century of Parks," to Director, National Park Service, 15 January 1971, RG 79, National Parks Centennial Commission, General Files, 1970–1973, Box 1, File: Advisory Committee, General Correspondence, NARA.
[354] National Park Service, Department of the Interior: Yellowstone: Flowering of an Idea, RG 79, National Parks Centennial Commission, General Files, 1970–1973, Box 9, File: Yellowstone. "The Flowering of an Idea" (pamphlet), NARA.

expected variations in the administration of these parks of other lands, but the basic concept is inherited.[355]

Ultimately, then, the difference in views on whether the park idea was born or even discussed at the Madison Junction campfire or whether it should be considered the product of a longer developmental process over time does not really matter, as the National Park Service's articulation of the idea still shared certain consistent points of emphasis. The national park idea, regardless of the actual importance of the Madison Junction campfire, was still a very American development, an inherently American idea that was now celebrated for its success both in the U.S. and abroad. As a story of the creation of the world's first national park, the campfire narrative provided a nostalgic and easily understandable traditional account. The discussion among park authorities over the details and the accuracy of the account is simply a great example of the importance of the narrative of Yellowstone as the starting point for national parks around the world.

3.3. Canadian National Parks and Post-War International Co-operation

In this section, I argue that Canada had similar international programs but not the cultural export dimension as the United States. As noted in chapter 1, Canada established its first national park in 1885, and Canada actively co-operated with the United States from early on in its park history. Canada was the first country in the world to establish a national parks agency with the creation of the National Parks Branch (or, the Dominion Parks Branch as it was called at the time)[356] in 1911—five years before the United States created its own National Park Service.

So, Canada could have staked a claim to primacy and challenged the American narrative that focused so strongly on the beginning of world park movement at Yellowstone. Canada, however, did not show a similar interest in exporting the national park idea as a Canadian invention or cultural ideal in its international park co-

[355] Ibid.
[356] The Canadian National Parks Branch has gone by several different names during its history—for clarity's sake, I will refer to it as the "National Parks Branch" throughout the study.

operation, even though it participated in and arranged many forms of international co-operation on park matters.

This subchapter examines some examples of the Canadian National Parks Branch's international connections and programs.[357] I will show that there were similar developments in international co-operation as in the United States, but that Canada's park work was not as internationally focused as were American practices. This comparison further highlights the importance Americans placed on exporting the national park idea as an American idea and demonstrates the unique nature of American park export practices. Canadians, despite showing an interest in international programs and having similar expertise in park matters, did not have the same motivation for exporting the park idea and attaching other meanings to it, even if they understood the benefits of international co-operation.

However, the fact that the Canadian National Parks Branch did not claim the national park idea to be a Canadian export did not mean that it did not assert the Canadian character and origin of national parks in national contexts. Discussions and policy documents on national parks contained many patriotic references. In 1957, a policy document even removed a reference to early U.S. influence on Canadian parks, replacing it with a remark that Canadians were the first to create a national parks bureau.[358]

Co-operation with American colleagues has always been important for the Canadian Parks Branch. American-Canadian correspondence included many matters related to the preservationist aspect of national parks, such as the role of science in the parks of both countries in 1939. The two park services often compared their park management practices. For example, Canadian parks staff noted that the American parks were more advanced in applying science to the biological conditions of national parks.[359] In correspondence from 1939, the Canadian Superintendent for Publicity and Information and the American Director of the Everglades National Park Association

[357] The chapter is based on a selection of Canadian national park files on international co-operation found in the Records of the Canadian Parks Service Record Group 84 [hereafter RG 84], Library and Archives Canada [hereafter LAC]. It is not relevant to discuss the Canadian case in further detail within the limits of this study—that should be done in a separate study.
[358] Jones, "Unpacking Yellowstone," 43.
[359] [F.H.H. Williamson], Controller, National Parks Bureau, Ottawa, to P.A. Taverner, National Museum of Canada, Department of Mines and Resources, Ottawa, 19 September 1939, RG 84, vol. 109, file U124, pt. 4, LAC.

agreed that "the development of the National Parks Idea in United States or Canada is helpful to National Parks in both countries."[360]

This co-operation continued after the war. The Canadian parks director, for example, asked his American colleague for advice on similar problems faced by parks in both countries, in this instance the pressures to allow for the development of water resources and extraction of timber. In this case from 1952, Canada's James Smart was hoping his American counterpart, Conrad L. Wirth, might provide some examples of how the U.S. parks have responded to pressures to develop or exploit the natural resources within parks.[361] Park officials in both countries often opposed these kinds of developmental pressures together and used material and experiences from both countries to strengthen their opposition. What is most notable about this correspondence is how the Canadian director reconfirmed the close connection between Canadian and American park matters:

> I recognize that National Park policy in the United States and Canada has remained on parallel and similar lines and that so long as this policy is solid in respect of long term management the one supports the other to some degree. In reverse of this situation, it would undoubtedly be the case where, if an important change in National Park policy were made in Canada, such a change would be quoted in support of a requested change in the United States.[362]

In 1961, Lloyd Brooks, Chief of the Planning Section in the Canadian National Parks Branch noted that certain articles on problems in American parks should be circulated as required reading among the senior Canadian parks staff, presumably to help them deal with similar issues at Canadian national parks.[363]

---

[360] Robert J.C. Stead, Superintendent, Publicity and Information, to Ernest F. Coe, Director, Everglades National Park Association, 30 January 1939, RG 84, vol. 109, file U124, pt. 4, LAC.
[361] J. Smart, Director, to Conrad L. Wirth, Director, National Park Service, Washington, D.C., 26 March 1952, RG 84, vol. 2068, file U124, pt. 6, LAC.
[362] Ibid.
[363] Lloyd Brooks, Chief, Planning Section, National Parks Branch, memorandum for J.R.B. Coleman, Director, National Parks Branch, "Articles on Problems of United States National Parks," 9 February 1961, RG 84, vol. 2068, file U124, pt. 7, LAC.

Canadians and Americans were in frequent correspondence. Canada turned to the U.S. for advice, but so too did American officials turn to their Canadian counterparts, with national parks in both countries being in comparable situations and facing similar challenges. For Canada, the U.S. provided most importantly practical knowledge and ideological support, while for Finland—as we will see in chapter 4—the American national park idea was more of a distant ideal to be imitated from afar (even if Finland also received practical knowledge from American park courses). In both cases, however, the imaginary power and influence of American national parks, especially Yellowstone, is clear.

American conservationists highlighted the unique position of Yellowstone. The Canadian National Parks Branch received a letter from the American Emergency Conservation Committee in May 1938 in which the committee sought support to prevent the exploitation of water resources in Yellowstone and argued that "No National Park is safe if Yellowstone Park is invaded."[364] In Canada, it was noted in 1948—when reading American annual reports to gather useful information—that Yellowstone was no longer the most popular park in the United States. "A striking feature is that Yellowstone Park, the oldest and largest unit in the U.S. system, no longer attracts the greatest number of visitors," the report noted.[365]

However, Yellowstone continued to be important at a global level because of its mythical connotations. This was apparent, for example, in the case of Tongariro National Park in New Zealand, as the park had a project named "Plan 72," to be ready in 1972. The name pointed to the mythical American park: "The significance of 1972 is that it is the 50th anniversary of the Board and will also coincide with the Centenary of the Yellowstone National Park in the United States." It was noted that "Yellowstone is the oldest National Park in the world and to mark its centenary, the United States Government will be declaring 1972 National Parks year…"[366]

Canada participated in exchange programs and other forms of international co-operation. However, Canada did not put the same emphasis on

[364] Letter "Dear Conservationist," from Mrs. C.N. Edge, Chairman, Emergency Conservation Committee, New York, 13 May 1938, RG 84, vol. 109, file U124, pt. 4, LAC.
[365] [W.F. Lothian], Assistant Controller, to Mr. Gibson "Re: Annual Report of United States National Park Service," Ottawa, 19 June 1948, RG 84, vol. 109, file U124, pt. 5, LAC.
[366] *National Park News* vol. 6, no. 3, August 1964 [Copy of a New Zealand publication, found in] RG 84, vol. 2068, file U124, pt. 8, LAC.

becoming a world leader in national park matters as did the United States, even though international co-operation was deemed important and Canadians helped other countries as best they could. I will briefly mention some examples of Canadian ventures in international park matters.

In 1954, Australian authorities proposed a program for the exchange of government officials between Australia and Canada for "fostering closer relations between the two countries" and in order to exchange helpful information and experience.[367] The idea was well-received in Canada. However, the National Parks Branch felt they could not spare a man to attend at the time.[368]

As we saw in the previous chapter, the United States was very interested in connections with Japanese national parks after the war. Canadian and Japanese park officials had links, too. In the early 1950s, Japan was interested in hearing about how Canada's parks were being administered, with the Canadian Mission in Tokyo even translating a Canadian national park brochure into Japanese. Japanese officials noted that they would also be happy to provide information about their parks.[369] An important Japanese park official, Mr. Tamura, pointed out the developments in Japan-Canada relations and the importance of national park co-operation in this:

> It is needless to mention that the diplomatic, economic and cultural relationship between Japan and Canada should become all the more closer as the time goes by, and, as the consequence, the good-will sentiment between the peoples of both countries should be promoted to a greatest extent absolutely. I believe that it is extremely important for us, particularly, to take up and follow the system of the administration of the national parks of Canada, and we are looking forward, with keen interest,

[367] Copy of aide memoire "Exchange of officials between Australia and Canada," Australian High Commission, Ottawa, June 1954, RG 84, vol. 2068, file U124–2, pt. 2, LAC.
[368] J.R.B. Coleman, Chief, memorandum for Mr. J.A. Hutchison "Proposed Exchange of Officials with Australia," 20 July 1954, RG 84, vol. 2068, file U124–2, pt. 2, LAC.
[369] Archibald A. Day, Information Division, to J. Smart, Director, National Parks Branch, 9 May 1952, RG 84, vol. 2068, file U124–2, pt. 2, LAC.

> to have consummate a real intimate contact with the National Parks officials of your government in this respect for the long future.[370]

Both Tamura and the Vice Consul of Canada in Japan highlighted the role of national parks co-operation in promoting goodwill between the two countries. Vice Consul McGaughey noted the merits of Tamura's work in making Canadian parks better known in Japan: "We feel certain that knowledge about Canada makes for goodwill towards that country. Indeed, the spreading of good will is a primary function of Canadian diplomatic representation in Japan." He noted that they shared "a common cause—that of national parks—which cause is in essence that of human happiness."[371] Tamura responded that he believed "that the constant exchange of informations [sic] and mutual cooperation of the national parks of Canada and Japan would bring about the promotion of better understanding and increase the cultural senses of the people of both countries."[372]

Canada received its share of pleas for information. In the mid-to-late 1950s, letters asking for national park information came from, for example, Spanish and Pakistani officials as well as from East Africa and Ethiopia to help with the planning of parks in the said countries.[373] The Canadian Parks Branch also received park publications from other countries, for example from Brazil in 1955.[374]

In 1965, the National Parks Authority in New Zealand sought help on national parks administration and legislation from Canada: "As your country [Canada] and the United States are run much along the same lines as New Zealand, I am seeking

---

[370] Tsuyoshi Tamura, Chairman of the Board of Directors, The National Parks Association, to Mr. C.E. McGaughey, Second Secretary and Vice Consul, Canadian Liaison Mission, 13 March 1952, RG 84, vol. 2068, file U124–2, pt. 2, LAC.

[371] C.E. McGaughey, Vice Consul of Canada in Japan, to Mr. Tamura, 26 March 1952, RG 84, vol. 2068, file U124–2, pt. 2, LAC.

[372] Tsuyoshi Tamura, Chairman of the Board of Directors, to Mr. C.E. McGaughey, Vice Consul, Canadian Liaison Mission, 31 March 1952, RG 84, vol. 2068, file U124–2, pt. 2, LAC.

[373] Department of External Affairs, Canada, numbered letter to the Under-Secretary of State for External Affairs, Ottawa, Canada from Canadian Embassy, Madrid, "Request for publications on the national parks of Canada," 15 January 1957; Mahdi Masud, Third Secretary, Office of the High Commissioner for Pakistan, Ottawa, to the Director, National Parks Division, Department of Northern Affairs & Natural Resources, Ottawa, 28 November 1956; J.R.B. Coleman, Chief, to Hon. L.E.R. Dreschfield, Q.C., Entebbe, Uganda, East Africa, 22 October 1956; [Illegible], Inspector General, Imperial Ethiopian Government, Ministry of Agriculture, to J.R.B. Coleman, Chief, National Parks Branch, 23 February 1955, RG 84, vol. 2068, file U124–2, pt. 2, LAC.

[374] J.R.B. Coleman, Chief, to W. Duarte De Barros, Administrador Do Parque Nacional Do Itatiaia, Brasil, 25 October 1955, RG 84, vol. 2068, file U124–2, pt. 2, LAC.

your guidance for this National Parks Review."[375] In 1965, information was also sent to Kenya.[376] There were likewise discussions about Canadian assistance on park planning in Turkey in 1963.[377]

Many international visitors traveled to Canada to learn from its national parks and participate in its programs. For example, in 1968 the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (which the National Parks Branch was part of) hosted a group of overseas students from Ottawa's Carleton University, who learned about the work of the Department, including the history and development of the country's national parks.[378] The Canadian Parks Branch also hosted individual visitors, such as Mr. Ali from Pakistan, who held a BSc in Forestry and an MSc in Botany and who had also "just completed a diploma program at the University of Toronto." In 1967, the Canadian Parks Branch noted in its internal correspondence that when Mr. Ali "returns to his homeland, he will be in charge of all parks and wildlife work in East Pakistan."[379] Director of the Canadian Parks Branch, J.R.B. Coleman, instructed his regional staff to familiarize Ali with the work and operations of the parks agency, including fieldwork. He noted:

> In view of Canada's interest in and emphasis on external aid, the Department and Branch has committed itself to produce the best possible show for this gentleman. I realize that his presence during the busy season will present complications, but it would be greatly appreciated if you could do what you can to let him see what he wants.[380]

---

[375] P.H.C. Lucas, Secretary, National Parks Review Working Party, National Parks Authority of New Zealand, to J.R.B. Coleman, Director of National Parks Branch, 8 November 1965, RG 84, vol. 2068, file U124–2, pt. 2, LAC.
[376] John I. Nicol, Assistant Director, to P.M. Olindo, Deputy Director, Kenya National Parks, Nairobi, Republic of Kenya, 23 June 1965, RG 84, vol. 2068, file U124–2, pt. 2, LAC.
[377] J.R.B. Coleman, Director, to William Hart, International Commission on National Parks, Washington D.C., U.S.A, 9 July 1963, RG 84, vol. 2068, file U124–2, pt. 2, LAC.
[378] Program, "Visit of the overseas students at Carleton University to the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development," 6–7 March 1968, RG 84, vol. 2108, file U172–13–1, pt. 3, LAC.
[379] J.R.B. Coleman, Director, to the Regional Director, Western Region and the Regional Director, Central Region, "Pakistani Student, Mr. Syed Salamat Ali – External Aid," 24 May 1967, RG 84, vol. 2108, file U172–13–1, pt. 3, LAC.
[380] Ibid.

Another Canadian park official also noted that the Canadian parks agency "would be very busy" during Ali's visit, "but that in the interests of international good will and assistance we would do everything possible to help."[381]

In 1966, the Canadian Parks Branch received was a visitor from India, Mr. Dutta, who was a government employee in his own country. He had arrived "in early May to spend six months in Canada under the auspices of the External Aid Office," to learn about park management practices in Canadian national parks. The Western Region's Regional Director received instructions from the National Parks Branch Director's office to offer a good program of study, one covering field work, administration, and policy, for Mr. Dutta. This was important, as Dutta would apply his knowledge back home in India: "Remember that Mr. Dutta on his return to India will presumably attempt to use what is good and avoid what he considers defaults of our system."[382] Again, it was understood that hosting visitors was an extra burden for parks staff but important nonetheless:

> I realize that the presence of a student or observer travelling for some length of time within your Region will put an additional strain on your staff. However, the Branch is committed to the project and it falls upon all of us to ensure that our image is properly presented to Mr. Dutta not only for his education but also for his memory once he returns to his own Country.[383]

In 1964, Mr. Boonruang Saisorn, a student from Thailand, visited Canadian parks to receive training in parks management. I. McT. Cowan, the Dean of the Faculty of Graduate Studies at the University of British Columbia, where Saisorn was studying, felt that the National Parks Branch had offered very good program for the visitor. As he was "to be the first superintendent of the first national park to be established in

[381] Alex J. Reeve, Assistant Director (National Parks), to Mr. Brooks & Mr. Kun, "Pakistani Student – External Aid," 12 May 1967, RG 84, vol. 2108, file U172–13–1, pt. 3, LAC.
[382] R.T. Flanagan for J.R.B. Coleman, Director, to the Regional Director, Western Region, "Mr. Jayat Jyoti[?] Dutta, Colombo Plan Candidate in Canada to Study Wildlife Conservation and Park Management," 18 May 1966, RG 84, vol. 2108, file U172–13–1, pt. 3, LAC.
[383] Ibid.

Thailand," Cowan thought "the effort we are putting into his training and to giving him some practical experience is extremely valuable."[384]

It seems that the National Parks Branch was quite busy and considered visitors a nuisance at times, but it was committed to help. It still seems, though, that Canadians did not place the same importance and meaning on international work, despite the visits of foreign students and officials. Canadian international park work did not have the same heavy promotional connotations as did American Cold war era park connections, and certainly Canadian officials did not assert that the park idea was a Canadian idea, even if the Canadian National Parks Branch wanted to make a good impression on visitors.

Canada was also interested in participating in personnel exchanges with other countries. Examples include the United States and Australia. Both Canada and the United States were interested in strengthening their mutual co-operation and the exchange of views on park matters. Correspondence from 1965 indicates that discussions were held about a program for the temporary exchange of personnel as well as a plan for holding joint meetings on more specific questions, such as the International Waterton-Glacier Peace Park.[385] The press release from March 1968 for the exchange program of national park staff between Canada and the U.S. stated that

> While the national park systems differ in detail and have developed independently of each other, Canada and the United States have led the world in the application of the common National Park principle that significant lands and historic sites must be preserved in an original state so that the public can derive enjoyment and knowledge from them.[386]

[384] I. McT. Cowan, Dean, Faculty of Graduate Studies, University of British Columbia, to J.R.B. Coleman, Director, National Parks Branch, 17 September 1964, RG 84, vol. 2108, file U172–13–1, pt. 3, LAC.

[385] J.R.B. Coleman, Director, to Deputy Minister, "Relations Between U.S. National Park Service and This Branch," 7 June 1965; J.R.B. Coleman, Director, to Deputy Minister, "Temporary Exchange of Personnel with U.S. National Park Service," 7 June 1965; Director Hartzog to J.R.B. Coleman, 15 June 1965; Theodor R. Swem, Assistant Director, to J.R.B. Coleman, 13 July 1965, RG 84, vol. 2068, file U124, pt. 8, LAC.

[386] Press Release, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, "International Exchange of Park Staff," Ottawa, 6 March 1968, RG 84, vol. 2108, file U172–13–3, pt. 1, LAC.

These exchanges were hoped to be mutually beneficial, with the countries hoping to gain knowledge about each other's parks and apply the information so as to avoid and solve similar problems back home.[387] Canada also had a personnel exchange agreement with the Australian state of New South Wales.[388] For example, an Australian officer named J.A. Erskine was to spend six months in Canada in 1968.[389]

Canada was also actively involved in the International Short Courses in Administration of National Parks and Equivalent Reserves, first sending park officials to attend the courses and later participating in organizing them by becoming a co-operative partner, with the U.S. National Park Service, University of Michigan and the Conservation Foundation being the main organizers.[390] A Conservation Foundation letter from 1967 noted that

> In order to make the course more genuinely international and to reduce an unavoidable American bias, the Canadian National Park Service has agreed to join, as a visiting sponsor, the 1968 course, which will begin at the Glacier-Waterton International Peace Park[…][391]

There was, apparently, some thought as to whether these events seemed too American.

As we can see here, Canada was internationally minded and saw the advantages of international park co-operation. Canadian officials wanted foreign visitors to Canadian national parks to have a good impression of them, but they did not seek to export the national park idea in the same way as the United States. Canadian park officials were active in their international connections and in frequent correspondence with their American colleagues, while also providing good assistance to other countries. Next, we will turn to a different story of international co-operation and influence and

---

[387] Ibid.
[388] Alex J. Reeve, Assistant Director (National Parks), Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Department, For file, "Personnel Exchanges – U.S.A. and New South Wales," 15 February 1968, RG 84, vol. 2108, file U172–13–3, pt. 1, LAC.
[389] J.R.B. Coleman, Director, to the Honourable T.L. Lewis, Minister for Lands, Sydney, N.S.W., Australia, 7 March 1968; J.R.B. Coleman, Director, to the Honourable T.L. Lewis, Minister for Lands, Sydney, N.S.W., Australia, 14 February 1968, RG 84, vol. 2109, file U172–13–5, pt. 1, LAC.
[390] This is too wide a topic to discuss here in more detail. For Canadian involvement in short courses, see RG 84, vol. 2109, file U172–13–6, pt. 1, LAC.
[391] Harold M. Prowse, Associate, The Conservation Foundation, Washington DC, to Steve Kun, Assistant Chief of Operations, National and Historic Parks Branch, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Ottawa, Canada, 30 November 1967, RG 84, vol. 2109, file U172–13–6, pt. 1, LAC.

examine a country that came to embrace the national park idea as an American idea to a great extent, despite different park beginnings, conditions, and resources.

Chapter 4

Inserting Yellowstone into a National Story: The American Influence on the National Park Idea in Finland

This chapter—a national case study—seeks to make two contributions. The first is the main argument of this chapter—that the park idea became "Americanized" throughout the 20th century in Finland, despite its rather different origins and early history. This did not mean just modeling national parks with American technical knowledge but that the national park idea became articulated along American lines and connected to the American beginning of national parks. Secondly, the chapter also pays attention to the ways in which national parks are not just a national means for nature conservation, but constantly being renegotiated and developed in a transnational framework. Examining Finnish national park history as a case study is important because it enables a closer look at the emerging American influence on national park matters. Through the example of one country, we can track the actual effect of many of the ideals and programs discussed in the previous chapters.

Finnish national parks originally followed the European preservationist beginnings outlined in chapter 1. However, it was only in 1938 that the first national parks were officially established in Finland. I will first address the development and influences of national parks in Finland up to the 1950s, before turning to examining the growing influence of American national parks on Finnish national parks, on how they were to be developed, but most importantly, on the origin of the national park concept and the ideals and ideologies inherent in the idea of national parks. I will then illustrate the situation which made Finnish parks receptive to American national park ideals in the Cold War years. Finally, the chapter examines how the American influence on Finland's national parks grew to the point where Yellowstone could be presented as the origin of all parks worldwide.

The chapter will show that highlighting the international dimension of national parks helped develop them nationally. This illustrates that the point highlighted in American national park officials' international work—that international co-operation

in national park matters was absolutely vital—was a relevant one. These themes were also connected to Cold War politics and the export of cultural ideals.

4.1. National Origins, International Examples: The National Park Idea in Finland up to the 1950s

The first person to suggest the creation of national parks in the Nordic countries was the Finnish-Swedish arctic explorer and geologist Adolf Erik Nordenskiöld. In 1880, he published a proposal for establishing national parks in the Nordic countries, which noted the destruction brought on by modern technology and culture. He worried that in the future, it would no longer be possible to find original landscapes of the fatherland. Nordenskiöld predicted that after a century, people would be interested in seeing nature as it once was and noted that there were many suitable state lands in the Nordic countries that could be protected in their primeval state without significant expenditure or economic loss. Nordenskiöld suggested that these parks should not emulate foreign models (such as European zoos); instead, they should be such parks he had proposed that fit the northern climate and would become famous and beneficial for future generations. Nordenskiöld's arguments for the establishment of national parks were heavily connected to the patriotic and educational mission of national parks.[392]

Before the idea of national parks, there had been some earlier measures to protect nature in Finland. The measures had mostly focused on preserving certain nationally significant landscapes for tourist use or the conservation of forest areas.[393] Nordenskiöld's proposal was enthusiastically received by foresters and scientists in Finland, and they discussed it in many of their meetings—therefore, early definitions of and purposes for national parks tended to focus on science and forestry. In fact,

[392] A.E. Nordenskiöld, "Ehdotus valtionpuistojen perustamiseksi pohjoismaihin" [Förslag till inrättandet af Riksparker i de nordiska länderna], 1880, quoted in Finnish in Rolf Palmgren, *Luonnonsuojelu ja kulttuuri* I-II (Helsinki: Otava, 1922), 51–53. Note that Nordenskiöld's term "rikspark" is more literally translated as "state's park." For more information on Nordenskiöld, see Seija A. Niemi, *A Pioneer of Nordic Conservation: The Environmental Literacy of A. E. Nordenskiöld (1832–1901)*, Doctoral Dissertation (Turku: University of Turku, 2018); Seija A. Niemi, "The Historical Roots of A. E. Nordenskiöld's (1832–1901) Conservational Philosophy," *Scandinavian Journal of History* 43, 5 (December 2018): 581–600.

[393] Mika Pekurinen, "Sivistys velvoittaa: Klassinen luonnonsuojelu Suomessa," in *Luonnon ehdoilla vai ihmisen arvoilla?: Polemiikkia metsiensuojelusta 1850–1990*, ed. Heikki Roiko-Jokela (Jyväskylä: Atena, 1997), 130.

Finland's nature conservation[394] movement as a whole was highly academic and scientific from the beginning. Many early commentators on and promoters of the national park idea in Finland used scientific reasons as an argument for their creation and stressed the benefits of national parks to such academic fields as forestry, botany, zoology, and geology.

For example, in an 1881 forestry association meeting, A. G. Blomqvist, director of Evo Forestry School, spoke in favor of Nordenskiöld's proposal of preserving the original nature of the country, but he also proposed creating a completely different kind of a park: one that would exhibit various artificially planted trees and bushes. Ragnar Hult gave a speech in the meeting of the Geographical Society in 1891 stressing the great scientific and practical value of national parks, especially for botany and forestry as well as zoology and geology. He cautioned against blindly following experiences from foreign countries, as they might not work well in Finland's conditions. Some years later, in 1898, the national park question was brought up in a meeting of Societas pro Fauna et Flora Fennica. Professor J. P. Norrlin broadened the concept of a national park to consist of general nature conservation as well as the conservation of endangered plant and animal species. Norrlin's thoughts on the matter followed along the lines of German conservation thought, according to which there would have to be a survey of all original zones of vegetation first. Scientific societies in Finland worked together in order to achieve the establishment of national parks in the country. In 1904, Professor J. A. Palmén gave a presentation in a meeting of the Geographical Society on protecting natural monuments, which was closely connected to patriotism. Palmén followed and endorsed the examples set by German Professor Hugo Conwentz in the early 1900s.[395]

Nordenskiöld's proposal and the many speeches in favor of establishing national parks in Finland gathered positive attention and support, but despite the

[394] A note on the terminology: the Finnish language does not have direct equivalents for preservation and conservation; rather, the word *luonnonsuojelu* encompasses both. I have mostly used "conservation" here, following the example of the terminology used in some of the Finnish reports that were written in English and which used the word "conservation." In some cases, I refer to preservation or protection—so these three words are used in this chapter rather interchangeably, despite the divisions between preservation and conservation in the American context. For example, Vilho Kujala's 1932 report, which I will later discuss, uses all three words. For the 1960s and 1970s, especially when writing about American national parks, I have made a point to use "preservation" as that was clearly the most appropriate term for those ideas.

[395] For more on the discussion of national parks in Finland see Palmgren, *Luonnonsuojelu ja kulttuuri*, 159–204, and Pekurinen, "Sivistys velvoittaa," 129–165.

initiatives of conservation-minded foresters and scientists, nothing was done about the matter of parks for many years to come, as more pressing concerns relating to forestry or the conditions of local people required the attention of officials.

It is safe to say that the early Finnish ideas for national parks differed greatly from the realization of parks in the United States. In his 1909 report on forestry research, a notable Finnish forester, who later became Professor of Forestry, Director of the Board of Forestry, and the Prime Minister of Finland, A. K. Cajander, outlined three different types of parks that had been mentioned in discussions about national and nature parks. He mentioned that earlier proposals had combined at least three different functions: parks that preserved nature for scientific purposes, parks that would grow foreign trees, and parks that were meant for public enjoyment for all nature lovers, tourists, artists, friends of all living creatures, and everyone who loved their fatherland. According to Cajander, "All of these purposes cannot be realized in one single park. Primeval nature cannot be preserved in a park to which tourists, artists, and all patriotic citizens have free entry. That kind of a park will sooner or later become another Kaivopuisto Park or Kaisaniemi Park [popular city parks in Helsinki]. If we wish to realize all of these different purposes, there need to be separate parks."[396] Cajander, therefore, saw parks that were meant for public enjoyment as inherently separate from those concerned with preserving nature. Amusement parks for tourists, such as the tourist destinations Koli or Punkaharju, had nothing to do with parks that preserved primeval nature unimpaired for future generations—quite in contrast to the American national park idea, which combined preservation and *use* and was partly motivated by tourism profit from the beginning. This is interesting, as Koli for example, with its sublime landscape and significance as a national landscape, could easily have been made to follow the model of Yellowstone-style parks. Punkaharju already had a hotel, so it too could have been made into a national park designed for tourists if the Finnish national park idea had had a greater emphasis on tourism at this time.

[396] "Kaikkia näitä tarkotuksia ei sama puisto voi toteuttaa. Alkuperäistä luontoa ei sellaisessa puistossa voida ylläpitää, minne on täysin vapaa pääsy turisteilla, taiteilijoilla ja kaikilla, jotka isänmaataan rakastavat. Sellainen puisto muuttuu ennemmin tai myöhemmin toiseksi Kaisaniemeksi tai Kaivopuistoksi. Jos kaikkia näitä eri tarkotusperiä tahdotaan toteuttaa, ovat kaikki puistot erikseen perustettavat." A. K. Cajander, *Metsätieteellinen tutkimustoiminta ulkomailla ja ehdotus sen järjestämiseksi Suomessa* (Helsinki: 1909, liite Metsähallituksen vuosikertomukseen v. 1907), 129.

German Professor Hugo Conwentz was a great intellectual influence on conservation thought in Finland in the early 1900s.[397] The American realization of national parks was known in Finland, but it was not really considered an influence to draw from. Rolf Palmgren—ornithologist, long-time conservationist, intendent of the Korkeasaari Zoo in the Finnish capital, and the country's first Government Counselor for the Conservation of Nature (from 1924 to 1930)—wrote a book on nature conservation thought and measures in Finland. *Naturskydd och kultur* [*Nature Conservation and Civilization*] was published in 1920–22. Palmgren was a pioneer of nature conservation in Finland, whose books educated the public about conservation ideas. *Nature Conservation and Civilization* provides a good window into the influences on Finland's nature conservation efforts during this time. Palmgren viewed Germany and the other Nordic countries as suitable examples for Finland to follow when organizing the country's nature conservation. For example, after quoting Nordenskiöld's proposal for the establishment of national parks in the Nordic countries in full, Palmgren mentioned that even before this proposal, the United States of America had established the famous Yellowstone National Park in Wyoming. After a very brief outline of the natural features and wildlife preservation in the park, Palmgren's attention turned to Germany—referred to as a pioneer of modern nature conservation, which had advised other countries as well.[398]

Hugo Conwentz received a special mention as having done most of this work. In fact, Palmgren devoted an entire section of the book to "Hugo Conwentz and Nature Conservation in Germany." Outlining the achievements of Hugo Conwentz and how they had influenced conservation in the Nordic countries, as well as detailing nature conservation measures in Germany, were a prominent feature of the book. Conwentz's thoughts on nature conservation were exemplified in his idea of natural monuments (*Naturdenkmäler*), by which he meant nationally representative natural curiosities that had been saved from destruction by culture and preserved in their original state in their original location. These could be natural formations such as large rocks or plant and animal species, for example. Natural monuments had important patriotic, educational, and scientific value. There were several natural features in

[397] For more on the discussion of national parks in Finland see Palmgren, *Luonnonsuojelu ja kulttuuri*, 159–204, and Pekurinen, "Sivistys velvoittaa," 129–165.
[398] Palmgren, *Luonnonsuojelu ja kulttuuri*, 54–55.

Finland that could be surveyed and then protected as natural monuments, following German examples. Palmgren found Conwentz's ideas about nature conservation, which had already been put into practice in Germany, suitable for Scandinavia if modified to suit local conditions. While he noted the great advances made in nature conservation in the United States, he could not address everything, but focused on Germany and Sweden, as "in addition to Germany, the cradle of the modern nature conservation movement, Scandinavia and Sweden in particular are close to us mostly on the basis of shared culture, similar nature, and corresponding economic conditions." Nature conservation in Scandinavia had begun to prosper after Professor Conwentz's visits to Denmark and Sweden. Sweden established its first national parks in 1909 and these developments were outlined by Palmgren.[399] It is clear that Palmgren—and undoubtedly others, too—considered Conwentz's ideas and their application and the advances of nature conservation in Scandinavia as the suitable examples to follow when trying to organize nature conservation in Finland.

In general, Palmgren was grim about the possibilities of nature conservation in Finland, noting in his book various examples of how nature had been raped by the advances made by human culture. Palmgren noted that popular recreational areas such as city parks had been degraded by buildings and man-made conveniences and designs. He cautioned against modern tourist traffic as a potential source of damage to nature and expressed his satisfaction over the fact that gigantic advertisements and billboards had not been allowed in Finnish parks.[400] Thus, it is easy to see from Palmgren's writings as well as those of his contemporaries that tourist traffic and its economic promise was not as important a factor in national park establishment in Finland as it was, for example, in the U.S. and Canada and heavily present in the American national park idea from the beginning.

Pamlgren repeatedly referred to nature conservation as something that enlightened nations practiced—and Finland should undertake it, too. To demonstrate that nature conservation work had an educational role among certain older enlightened nations, Palmgren outlined nature conservation measures in other countries. He began

[399] Ibid., 55–152. Quote from pp. 93–94. "Saksan, tuon nykyaikaisen luonnonsuojeluliikkeen kehdon ohella on Skandinaavia ja erityisesti Ruotsi meitä lähinnä yhteisen kulttuurin, samanlaisen luonnon ja samanlaatuisten taloudellisten olojen nojalla."
[400] Ibid., 21–35.

this section with a description of the developments that had led to the creation of Yellowstone, viewing the first American national park in terms of its preservation of primeval nature, bison and other wildlife, geologic features, and the potential for scientific research. Palmgren's brief description seemed to view Yellowstone as a timely and commendable idea, but one created for the specific, curious situation in the United States rather than a general model for the world. Palmgren devoted most of his attention to Germany and Sweden (which had been influenced by German models)—countries he considered the most suitable examples for Finland in terms of nature conservation.[401] Palmgren noted that in Sweden, it had been suggested that the American term "national park" would be replaced by "natural park" or "protected land." He thought that especially the concept of state's or nation's "protected land" carried a certain mythical power and impressiveness.[402] Therefore, the American concept of national park was not thought of as being mythical or special in any way at this time; rather, there were other concepts that would have suited the Nordic countries better.

Kaarlo Linkola, Professor of Botany, was commissioned by the Finnish State Board of Forestry to carry out an examination of possible park areas in the summer of 1925. His report from 1926 about possible areas for national and natural parks in Northern Finland formed the basis for conservationists' battle to achieve legislation for nature protection areas in the following years. Even more interesting than the actual contents of the report is its language. It is a telling example of the influence of German conservation tradition on nature conservation work and forestry research in Finland that Linkola's report was written in Finnish, followed by a summary in German.[403] The only remark in Linkola's report that seemed to follow American articulation of national parks was a single comment highlighting what a curious natural feature the Pyhätunturi mountain was (even though it was not necessarily representative of general natural conditions) and that the creation of a protected area there would not mean any kind of economic sacrifice.[404] This echoes Alfred Runte's well-known worthless lands thesis, according to which the early American national parks could only

[401] Ibid., 368–386.
[402] Ibid., 123.
[403] Kaarlo Linkola, "Suunnitelma luonnonsuojelualueiden erottamiseksi Pohjois-Suomen valtionmailla," *Silva Fennica* 1 (1926): 1–76.
[404] Ibid., 11.

be established in areas that were otherwise worthless, that is, places where no other profit could be extracted.[405]

It was only in 1938 that the first national parks were officially established in Finland. This was preceded by a great number of proposals for the creation of parks, other conservation measures, and a number of legislative difficulties and delays.[406] A nature conservation law was passed in parliament in 1922 and approved by the president in 1923. The law gave provisions for the establishment of general nature conservation areas (to protect untouched nature) and special nature conservation areas (to protect a scenic monument of nature or a specific plant or animal species).[407] This division between nature parks and national parks showed the German influence of protecting special natural monuments. Such special monuments were not established on Finnish state lands as such.[408] In Finland, the state established two kinds of parks for the conservation of nature: national parks and nature parks.[409] Nature parks were strict nature reserves, which also highlights the fact that Finnish ideas behind the establishment of national parks were to a large degree different from American ones, as not only did Finnish national parks have a more scientific purpose than America's national parks, but that in addition to national parks, there had to be stricter reserves as well.

The national park idea in Finland, then, was considered to have originated from Nordenskiöld's proposal. Proposals for organizing nature conservation in the country were most influenced and supported by German and Nordic examples, and arguments for the creation of national parks focused heavily on highlighting their purpose in preserving samples of primeval nature, scientific research, and nature education. This origin story and the main influences and purposes of parks would later change.

---

[405] Alfred Runte, *National Parks: The American Experience*, 2nd, rev. ed. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1987 [1979]).
[406] Pekka Borg and Hannu Ormio, *Perustiedot kansallispuistoista: ihanteet ja käytäntö* (Porvoo: WSOY, 1978), 42–46; Pekurinen, "Sivistys velvoittaa," 129–154.
[407] *Luonnonsuojelulaki*, 71/1923, 1 §.
[408] Borg and Ormio, *Perustiedot kansallispuistoista*, 51.
[409] Hallituksen esitys n:o 96 (1937vp) eräiden luonnonsuojelualueiden perustamisesta valtionmaille. The legislation did not make such notable difference between these areas, as both were meant as representative areas of nature conservation. In national parks (special nature conservation areas), visitors were taken into account, while in nature parks (general nature conservation areas) no facilities could be built. The Finnish terms for national park and nature park are "kansallispuisto" and "luonnonpuisto".

The German connections were strong, but this is not to say that Finnish conservation authorities did not have connections with American park officials from early on. In fact, Finnish conservation officials wrote about national parks in Finland to the United States even before any national parks had officially been created in Finland, replying to queries from Americans who had set to work collecting information about national parks around the world through diplomatic channels, as already noted. The first Finnish report from 1920 mentioned that it was Nordenskiöld (in 1880) who had first brought up the idea of national parks in Finland and formulated the basic principle that national parks would "conserve to future generations some untouched bits of primitive Nature." The report made no mention of Yellowstone or its possible impact, even though it was written to be sent to the United States. The report then outlined the discussion of the park question in scientific societies since the late 1800s and described several national and natural parks in Finland, noting their features and accessibility, mentioning that "So far only two national parks in the proper sense of the word have been brought into being,"[410] even though no areas had officially been established as national parks at that time.

A report from 1927 likewise noted that the issue of creating national parks in Finland had first been brought up in 1880.[411] In 1932, Vilho Kujala, the Government Counselor for Nature Conservation, provided commentary on the national park situation in Finland upon request by the United States legation in Helsinki. Kujala mentioned that "our noted explorer" Nordenskiöld had first urged the creation of national parks in the country. Kujala explained that on the basis of the law for the conservation of nature, many areas for the protection of nature had already been established, despite the fact that official decisions had not yet been made by the parliament. He noted the difference between the two kinds of preservation areas established in Finland—natural parks and national parks—and wrote that "these last named correspond closest to American National Parks."[412] It is noteworthy, then, that the Finnish officials responsible for

[410] Translation of report by the Finnish Department of Forestry, August 1920, RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 630, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Finland, 1920–46, NARA. Quotes from p. 1.
[411] "Report on the latest developments of the question of natural conservation in Finland," RG 79, Entry 10: Central Classified Files, 1907–1949, Box 630, File: 0–30 Foreign Parks, Finland, 1920–46, NARA.
[412] Translation of resumé submitted by Dr. Kujala, Helsingfors, November 2, 1932, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2170, File: L66 [Foreign Parks], Land Planning Division, Denmark, Finland, The Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden, 1932–36, NARA. Quotes from p. 1 and p. 3.

national parks were aware of American national parks at this time, but they did not mention them as having an influence, even when writing to the United States.

The need to create national parks in Finland in the early 1900s was justified with the argument that all cultured nations established parks. This came up in parliamentary discussions on national parks as well. Parliamentary discussions on nature conservation legislation and the establishment of national parks expressed a concern over local people and the possible negative impact of protected areas on their livelihoods, especially as the enclosure of open fields (*isojako*) had not yet been carried out in all areas.[413] This was one of the factors hindering the creation of parks in Finland. In 1928, Julius Ailio, Social Democratic Party MP and former Minister of Education, attempted to lobby for the establishment of nature conservation areas by trying to explain their function and value in the parliament:

> The main purpose of the proposal is of course cultural and to advance science, especially forestry research. In this regard, we lag behind every civilized nation. There have been a total of 10 of these nature conservation areas established in Sweden, 7 in Norway if I remember correctly. And I can make a reference to such a famous, large nature conservation area as Yellowstone park in North America, which is the size of the Uusimaa region. In Finland, the natural park idea has arisen already half a century ago. It was the noted explorer, our fellow countryman Adolf Erik Nordenskiöld who first proposed this idea, and it has since been upheld especially by geographers but also by foresters. In my opinion, it is about time that we implement this idea and in that regard fill our duty as a cultured nation.[414]

[413] Valtiopäivät 1927, Pöytäkirjat I, Istunnot 1–27, Valtiopäivien alusta marraskuun 25. päivään, Helsinki 1928: Valtioneuvoston kirjapaino, 9.9.1927 edustaja Hänninen, p. 54; Valtiopäivät 1928, Pöytäkirjat II, Istunnot 41–68, marraskuun 21. päivästä valtiopäivien loppuun, Helsinki 1929: Valtioneuvoston kirjapaino, edustajat Hannula ja Hänninen, 16.3.1928, p. 412–413, are a few such examples.

[414] Valtiopäivät 1928, Pöytäkirjat II, Istunnot 41–68, marraskuun 21. päivästä valtiopäivien loppuun, Helsinki 1929: Valtioneuvoston kirjapaino, edustaja Ailio, 16.3.1928, p. 412. "Esityksen päätarkoitus on tietenkin kultturellinen ja tieteellisen, etenkin metsätieteellisen tutkimuksen edistäminen. Me olemme tässä suhteessa jäljellä kaikista sivistysmaista. Ruotsissa on jo järjestetty tällaisia luonnonsuojelualueita kokonaista 10, Norjassa muistaakseni 7. Ja minä voin viitata sellaiseen tunnettuun suureen luonnonsuojelualueeseen kuin Yellowstonen puisto Pohjois-Amerikassa, alaltaan Uudenmaan läänin kokoinen. Suomessa on luonnonpuistoajatus herätetty jo puoli vuosisataa sitten. Se oli tunnettu tutkimusretkeilijä, maamiehemme Adolf Erik Nordenskiöld, joka ensin esitti tämän ajatuksen, ja sitä ovat

A year later, Ailio continued by noting that even Soviet Russia was ahead of Finland in organizing nature conservation. On the one hand, he was pleased that Soviet Russia was making the same efforts as civilized nations elsewhere in establishing a natural park, but on the other hand, if such a park was established in Soviet Russia, it meant that Finland lagged even further behind other countries.[415] In 1937, Prime Minister A. K. Cajander reminded the parliament that the national park idea was over half a century old, having first been proposed by Nordenskiöld, and he then gave a lengthy speech on what had been done to realize this goal since then. "The responsibilities of a civilized nation include also nature conservation. We are already almost too late in this matter," he concluded.[416] This is a good example of how international examples were used to argue for national parks in Finland. It also shows that the national park idea was not just a national idea, created to preserve nationally significant landscapes, but an idea that constantly developed in an international framework.

In a 1937 legislative proposal for the establishment of national parks and nature parks, it was noted that the matter had been severely delayed and that additional delays would cause significant harm to the possible tourism use of the areas, which the globally known concept of "national park" would undoubtedly boost:

> Every additional year of delay can be seen as an economic loss to those poor areas in Northern Finland which are located near the planned national parks that are suitable for tourist use. It is indeed clear that already the name "national park" would be the best kind of advertisement for these areas among domestic and foreign visitors.[417]

---

sen jälkeen pitäneet vireillä etenkin maantieteilijät mutta myöskin metsätieteilijät. Minun mielestäni on jo vihdoinkin se aika, että mekin panemme toimeen tämän ajatuksen ja siinä suhteessa täytämme velvollisuutemme kulttuurivaltiona."

[415] Toiset Valtiopäivät 1929, Pöytäkirjat I, Istunnot 1–35, valtiopäivien alusta marraskuun 27. päivään, Helsinki 1930: Valtioneuvoston kirjapaino, edustaja Ailio, 25.10.1929, p. 440.

[416] Valtiopäivät 1937, Pöytäkirjat II, Istunnot 42–81, syyskuun 1. päivästä valtiopäivien loppuun, Helsinki 1937: Valtioneuvoston kirjapaino, pääministeri Cajander, 29.10.1937, p. 1435–1438. Quote from p. 1438. "Kulttuurimaan velvollisuuksiin kuuluu myöskin luonnonsuojelu. Siihen alkaa meillä olla jo kahdestoista hetki."

[417] Valtiopäivät 1937, Liitteet I–XII, Helsinki 1937: Valtioneuvoston kirjapaino, p. 121, Lak. al. no. 17, Cajander ym.: Ehdotus laiksi eräiden luonnonsuojelualueiden perustamisesta valtionmaille. "Jokaisen viivyttelyvuoden voi myös katsoa tuottavan taloudellista menetystä niille köyhän Pohjois-Suomen paikkakunnille, joiden lähistöille matkailijain käyntipaikoiksi soveltuvia kansallispuistoja on suunniteltu. On nimittäin selvää, että jo kansallispuisto-nimitys olisi sekä koti- että ulkomaalaisten parissa mitä parhainta mainostusta näiden alueiden hyväksi."

The Finnish Association for Nature Conservation was founded in 1938. In Finland, classical nature conservation was foremost an academic interest at this time and, as noted in the discussion on early national park proposals, many early conservationists and founders of the Association came from the ranks of scientists. Kaarlo Linkola noted in 1941 that nature conservation in Finland had derived from academic and scientific goals, perhaps even to a too large degree.[418] Germany was the most important influence for science and conservation. Despite this heavy German influence on forestry and science in general, Finnish environmental historians have noted that the Finnish relationship to nature has some similarities to North American attitudes. It is also crucial to note the importance of forests in the national imagination and arts.[419]

So, in short: what was the national park idea in Finland before the Second World War? Between the years from Nordenskiöld's proposal in 1880 to 1945, Finnish nature conservation can be characterized as motivated by science, aesthetics, patriotism and nature education, and recreation. Indeed early proposals for national parks were dominated by such concerns for nature conservation, patriotism and nature education, and the needs of scientific research. A preservationist focus was clear and tourism function only modest; the promise of tourism profit did not figure heavily in the establishment of parks. National parks remained largely undeveloped. Perhaps because of this, the Finnish national park concept did not have a similar dual mandate that stressed preservation and use equally, nor were Finnish national parks developed as tourist resorts along the lines of American national parks. Tourist use was not heavy, so it did not pose a problem. All in all, proposals and ideas for nature conservation areas followed more along German lines than American lines. Finland's early national park discussions (and the Finnish relationship to nature in general) did carry a similar ethos of patriotism and the strong connection between wild nature and nation as was seen in

[418] Kaarlo Linkola, "Luonnonsuojelumme kehityksestä," *Suomen Luonto: Suomen luonnonsuojelun vuosikirja* (1941): 7–12.

[419] Timo Myllyntaus and Mikko Saikku, "Environmental History: A New Discipline with Long Traditions," in *Encountering the Past in Nature: Essays in Environmental History*, eds. Timo Myllyntaus and Mikko Saikku (2nd, rev. ed. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2001), 1–28; Heikki Mikkeli, "Metsäturkki ja sen jurot parturit: Näkemyksiä metsäluonnon ja kansanluonteen suhteesta 1800–1900-luvulla," *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* 90, 3 (1992): 200–215; Pekurinen, "Sivistys velvoittaa," 130–141; Timo Myllyntaus, "Suomalaisen ympäristöhistorian kehityslinjoja," *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* 89, 4 (1991): 321–331; Finn Arne Jørgensen et al. "Entangled Environments: Historians and Nature in the Nordic Countries," *Historisk Tidsskrift* (Norway) 92, 1 (2013).

the United States—as opposed to Central Europe, where old cultural landscapes and tamed nature were preferred. However, the national park idea was not really based on American models in Finland in the late 1800s or the early 1900s, as the idea was not as heavily focused on the tourism function as American parks, but instead it was more scientifically oriented than its American counterpart. It could be said that the Finnish national park idea, pre-1945, was something of a mix between the American idea and the Swiss model[420] (which was very heavily centered on scientific research), but with a national origin story of its own.

In 1938, Finland had established four national parks and six natural parks, but after boundary changes following the wars with the Soviet Union, only two natural and two national parks remained (under the Forest Research Institute's supervision), with the other parks now part of the Soviet Union. The leading scientific societies in Finland suggested establishing new national parks after the war. A national and natural parks committee was formed, and it made recommendations for the establishment of new parks.[421] Based on the report, seven new national parks were established in 1956. In the 1950s, tourism in national parks around the world was growing at a rapid pace. For example, an increasing number of recreational facilities were built in national parks in the United States and Canada to respond to the growing visitor numbers. In Finland, however, tourist numbers remained rather low and tourism development efforts in national parks were modest in scale. When establishing the new national parks in 1956, preservationist goals were notably more important than tourism goals. The parks were established on the State Board of Forestry's lands and remained under its supervision.[422]

---

[420] See Patrick Kupper, "Science and the National Parks: A Transatlantic Perspective on the Interwar Years," *Environmental History* 14, 1 (January 2009): 58–81; Patrick Kupper, *Wildnis schaffen: Eine transnationale Geschichte des Schweizerischen Nationalparks* (Bern: Haupt, 2012).

[421] Luonnon- ja kansallispuistokomitea, *Uusien luonnon- ja kansallispuistojen perustaminen valtion maille: luonnon- ja kansallispuistokomitean mietintö*, Komiteanmietintö, 1953, 9 (Helsinki: Suomen metsätieteellinen seura, 1953).

[422] Matti Helminen in, "Perämetsästä matkailukohteeksi vai päinvastoin? Kansallispuistojemme vaiheita," in *Kansallispuistojen juhlavuoden seminaari Kolilla 28.–29.10.1996*, ed. Timo Muhonen and Seija Sulonen, Metsäntutkimuslaitoksen tiedonantoja 718 (Joensuu: Metsäntutkimuslaitos, 1998), 8, notes the priority given to preservation.

There are many peculiar details in the administration of Finland's national parks—such as the division of national parks under the Forest Research Institute (METLA) and the State Board of Forestry (Metsähallitus), or the lack of resources for national park management. However, it is not possible or useful to examine these administrative matters in more detail here. For information on Finnish park administration and planning history, see Minttu Perttula, *Suomen kansallispuistojärjestelmän kehittyminen 1960–1990-luvuilla ja U.S. National Park Servicen vaikutukset puistojen hoitoon* (Vantaa: Metsähallitus, 2006).

In 1953, the International Union for the Protection of Nature (later the International Union for the Conservation of Nature) sent a query to Reino Kalliola, the Government Counselor for the Conservation of Nature, in order to compile information about national parks around the world for a publication called *Atlas of Nature Reserves in the World*. Jean-Paul Harroy of the IUPN instructed the recipient to provide information about "the philosophy which lead to the creation of nature reserves and national parks in your country," as well as a descriptive list of the basic details of the parks system and natural features, complete with maps and excellent photographs. The IUPN also provided the information it had available on Finnish parks and a classification chart to help in comparing the country's parks to an international classification system.[423] Kalliola wrote that the national park idea in Finland had originated from Nordenskiöld's proposal and had then been backed by societies of natural scientists, but that the establishment of national parks had been delayed by the political situation and the lack of a perceived need for nature conservation. Natural parks were preserved for science, while national parks were for the benefit of the public and tourists.[424] Kalliola did not make any reference to American or foreign parks. His report and its draft were written in English, with some Finnish comments. One such comment noted that "as can be seen from park regulations, the Finnish national park idea is a little closer to strict reserve than in many other countries."[425]

In the post-WWII years, developments in park creation were again connected to the idea of being part of a group of civilized, modern, and democratic nations. Taking part in international meetings was seen as crucial for national development in park matters. In a way, highlighting the international dimension of the

[423] Jean-Paul Harroy to Reino Kalliola, 5 January 1953, Folder: Atlas of Nature Reserves in the World – Finland 1953, Valtion luonnonsuojeluvalvojan arkisto, YM [The Records of the Government Counselor for the Conservation of Nature, Ministry of the Environment].

A note on this archival collection: The Records of the Government Counselor for Nature Conservation were a disorganized collection of boxes held in the basement of the Ministry of Environment when I examined them. Since my examination of these records in February 2014, part of the collection has been donated to the National Archives (Kansallisarkisto) and re-organized. Nowadays most of Reino Kalliola's material can be found at the National Archives. My references are to the Ministry of Environment collection, but the files have been named in a way that the reader should not have trouble finding them in the new National Archives collection.

[424] Kalliola's report "For the preparation of on [sic] atlas of nature reserves of the world." Folder: Atlas of Nature Reserves in the World – Finland 1953, Valtion luonnonsuojeluvalvojan arkisto, YM.

[425] Kalliola's report "For the preparation of on [sic] atlas of nature reserves of the world," p. 8. Folder: Atlas of Nature Reserves in the World – Finland 1953, Valtion luonnonsuojeluvalvojan arkisto, YM. "Kuten järjestyssäännöistä käynee selville, suomalainen kansallispuisto-käsite on hiukan lähempänä strict reserv:iä kuin monessa muussa maassa."

national park concept helped develop it nationally in Finland. In 1957, Niilo Söyrinki, President of the Finnish League for the Protection of Nature, wrote to the IUCN asking it to send a letter to the Finnish government, in order to make Finland join the IUCN, as the Finnish League for the Protection of Nature had trouble paying its membership fees as a nongovernmental member (and no doubt also in order to promote nature conservation in the country). Söyrinki noted that already during the previous year, the Finnish Forest Research Institute (which was officially concerned with nature conservation and also held the post of Government Counselor for Nature Conservation) had "made a promotion to extend the membership of the International Union to include the State of Finland." His letter continued,

> The Finnish League for the Protection of Nature suggests that the International Union might address a letter to the Finnish Ministry of Foreign Affairs noticing the establishment in December 1956 of the new nature parks and national parks in Finland. This means the solution of the nature and national park question in its entirety and places Finland among the most advanced countries concerning the protection of Nature. Referring to the above-mentioned protectional advance a desire should be expressed to include the State of Finland among the members of the International Union.[426]

Surely, Finnish conservationists did not think that nature conservation work had reached its goals in the country; this was merely a tactic to include Finland in the Union. Despite the conservationists' work, the Finnish state did not become a member of the IUCN until 1968. However, this—and similar earlier international appeals—nicely show the way national parks were used to create community of enlightened, modern nations, and that Finland needed to be a part of such a community. In this way, conservationists tried to employ international connections to help national park matters in Finland. In the

[426] Niilo Söyrinki to International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, 1.2.1957 and 4.2.1957 (quote from the latter), Suomen luonnonsuojeluliiton arkisto, 2 International Union for Conservation of Nature (1949–1974), Folder: 101 Suomen luonnonsuojeluliiton arkisto, File: Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistys: Kirjeenvaihto 1957–1974: International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources, KA.

post-war years, it was American national park work that would prove to be the most prominent international connection and have the most influence on Finland.

4.2. Cold War Connections: American Programs and International Conferences

The post-war period started Finland's attachment to the national park idea as an American invention. From the 1950s onwards, there was constant commentary on American national parks and their condition. National park developments in Finland were clearly reflected against those in the U.S., and Finnish national parks were likened to their U.S. counterparts. As noted previously, throughout the period from the early 20th century up to the 1950s or 1960s, Finnish conservationists would reply to inquiries from organizations (such as the IUCN in the post-war years) and write in their own publications that the national park idea in Finland derived from Nordenskiöld's ideas—therefore, they highlighted it as being for the most part a national development. At some point in the process, though, this changed and the standard account of the beginning of parks in Finland started mentioning American national parks—as if to draw a straight line from Yellowstone to the first Finnish parks.

To better put international co-operation in national park matters into context, it is essential to understand general American-Finnish relations during the Cold War. After the Second World War, Finland had a peculiar relationship with the Soviet Union. On the one hand, it was based on the Soviet wish to create a belt of peaceful neighbors with mutual assistance pacts, while on the other hand it was about the impossible situation Finland faced in how to deal with its powerful neighbor, against which it had fought two wars, and to resist the fate of communist Eastern European countries. Finland maintained friendly relations with the Soviet Union while looking for ways to co-operate with the West and the Nordic Countries. Careful not to complicate its relationship with the Soviet Union in the difficult post-war situation, Finland turned down the Marshall Plan in 1947. It was able to, however, benefit from loans and credits from the United States, but economic aid to Finland had to be such as not to create any complications. The Finno-Soviet Treaty of 1948 (the Agreement of Friendship, Cooperation, and Mutual Assistance) formed the basis for the two countries' relationship. Gradually during the Cold War, Finnish political leaders talked more and

more openly about Finland as a neutral country—an articulation that the Soviets also acknowledged. However, Finland and the Soviet Union were not equals; from time to time, the USSR chose to remind Finland of this fact. Finnish foreign policy was based on trying not to annoy the Soviet Union and allowing for a certain degree of Soviet influence on Finland's politics, even on Finnish domestic politics. Even if the United States and other countries often quietly understood Finland's difficult situation and supported the delicate balance, this Finnish foreign policy of maintaining friendly relations with the Soviet Union became known as *Finlandization*, referring to a situation in which a small independent country's foreign policy and domestic politics were strongly influenced by a powerful neighbor—or more specifically, that the need for Finland to maintain friendly relations with Moscow took precedence over any other alliances. Thus, official U.S. relations with Finland proceeded quietly and carefully and remained somewhat distant so as not to upset this delicate balance, since keeping Finland as an independent democracy next to the Soviet Union was in U.S. interests.[427] Close connections with the United States were not possible in political, economic, or military spheres. Perhaps Finland would not have even wanted closer ties with the U.S. As Jussi Hanhimäki points out, Nordic countries were at times critical of the U.S., its society and military campaigns during the Cold War, and they remained doubtful about the general sensibility of being too closely allied with it.[428]

The Cold War soon evolved into a publicity battle between the United States and the Soviet Union, making everything from sports to various kinds of cultural products tools that held political significance and could be used to promote suitable ideals. This cultural side of the Cold War has attracted scholarly attention. Marek Fields has noted the "somewhat universal acceptance over the decisive role the ideological and cultural dimension played in influencing the conflict's outcome." Cultural diplomacy—or propaganda or informational activities—attempts to appeal directly to people in foreign countries through, for example, cultural products, educational exchanges and language teaching, and in this way aid foreign policy (while also promoting international understanding). In Finland, given its geographical position and relationship

[427] Jussi M. Hanhimäki, *Scandinavia and the United States: An Insecure Friendship* (New York: Twayne Publishers, 1997), especially 14–15, 22–24, 26–29, 37, 41, 49–50, 95, 151–152, 179.
[428] Ibid., 62–65, 130–134, 139–143, for example.

with the Soviet Union, American cultural diplomacy, which discreetly upheld and reinforced Finland's Western ties, was especially important.[429]

After WWII, the United States quickly expanded its cultural diplomacy efforts in Finland. At first, activities included the supply and promotion of books and films, and for example, film screenings in co-operation with the Finnish-American Society, which became an important outlet for the promotion of American ideas and culture. American informational and cultural activities were consolidated under the USIS (United States Information Service) office in Helsinki in 1946. The USIS library was opened in the same year, and American officials were justly proud of the achievement, which proved popular among Finns. The screening of American movies (showcasing the country's history and technological advances, for example) also increased and films were also loaned out to organizations. Americans supplied Finnish newspapers with positive items about the United States and the American way of life as well.[430]

No doubt the "Americanization" of national parks in Finland can be seen in this broader framework of American cultural diplomacy, since it can be argued that the national park idea represented a similar kind of American product that could be promoted abroad in the same way as American movies or sports. The national park idea was a positive aspect of American culture that could be promoted during the Cold War.

In general, the situation for nature conservation in post-WWII Finland was not easy, as increasing amounts of forested areas were needed for industrial production. Amidst these economic pressures, conservationists worked to strengthen the foundations of conservation thought among Finns.[431] It is easy to understand why international examples and influences proved important during this time. That national parks or the national park idea were not well known or fully developed in Finland perhaps also contributed to providing suitable conditions for the American influence on the park idea to grow, in addition to the promotion of the American national park idea through American park programs. The Finnish park idea was perhaps quite open to

[429] Marek Fields, *Reinforcing Finland's Attachment to the West: British and American Propaganda and Cultural Diplomacy in Finland, 1944–1962*, Doctoral Dissertation (Helsinki: University of Helsinki, 2015), 11–15, 33–38, 137. Quote from p. 13.
[430] Ibid., 87–90, 97–101, 124–128, 173–177.
[431] Pirkko Leino-Kaukiainen, "Fontainebleausta Rioon: Luonnonsuojeluaate ja metsäluonto," in *Luonnon ehdoilla vai ihmisen arvoilla?: Polemiikkia metsiensuojelusta 1850–1990*, ed. Heikki Roiko-Jokela (Jyväskylä: Atena, 1997), 172–175.

influences, as it was not well known by the public or well-organized by park authorities. It seems reasonable to say that there was not a clear public understanding of national parks. In 1949, park rangers were instructed that it was important not to appear too eager to carry out their duties since the national park concept was still so little known among the public that it had to be constantly explained to visitors and was "only slowly sinking into the public's mind." Therefore, officials noted that explanations and instructions were needed more than anything else and only after that came the ranger's duty of prohibiting unwanted behaviors.[432]

Already in the 1950s, Finnish conservationists had ample first-hand expert knowledge available about American national parks through their own travels and connections. Through these personal connections, national park ideas spread and were shaped. Patrick Kupper has noted that communities and networks of scientists were very important in international national park work.[433] Scientists were also central to the transfer of American park knowledge and ideals to Finland.

One possible way of building connections and co-operating with the U.S. included cultural and educational exchange. Despite the delicate relationship with the Soviet Union, and despite Finland's initial refusal to join the Fulbright program, Finns were able to take part in the program fairly quickly after its launch. The exchange program was first started in 1949 as a special ASLA exchange, which took its name from Finland's earlier loan repayments to the U.S. Finland joined the Fulbright program in 1952, after hard work and special amendments by Americans to make it possible, and the program became known as the ASLA-Fulbright program. Educational exchange with the U.S. enabled Finnish graduate students and specialists to travel to the United States to study, and somewhat later, it allowed for Americans to travel to Finland. The program also included the shipment of books and other equipment from the U.S. to Finland. The U.S. Legation in Helsinki thought highly of the impact of personal visits to the United States as a way of building understanding and goodwill towards the U.S. The

[432] "Pyhätunturin kansallispuiston järjestyssäännöt. Lisäohjeita alueen vartijalle," Metsäntutkimuslaitoksen arkisto, Hallinto-osasto, tutkimusaluetoimisto, Folder: Hfb:2, Luonnonsuojelualueet, kansallispuistot, kokeilualueet (1723–1971), File: Pyhätunturin kansallispuisto, Järjestyssäännöt 1949, Kirjeitä 1939–1947, Piirirajankäyntiasiakirja 1961, 1939–1961, KA. The same thing was also found in the regulations of the popular Pallas-Ounastunturi National Park.

[433] Patrick Kupper, "Nature's Laboratories? Exploring the Intersection of Science and National Parks," in *National Parks Beyond the Nation: Global Perspectives on "America's Best Idea"*, ed. Adrian Howkins, Jared Orsi, and Mark Fiege (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2016), 114–132.

ASLA-Fulbright program was significant in redirecting Finnish academic traditions to look to the U.S. instead of Europe. The relative size of the Finnish-American Fulbright program was impressive, as was the impact of staying in the U.S. on Finns and their thoughts about the U.S. The program was quite successful in shaping the Finns' perceptions of the United States, and it kept growing through the 1960s. The USIS also encouraged returning grantees to lecture and write about their experiences in the US.[434] Marek Fields has noted that already in 1951, the U.S. Legation in Finland viewed the exchange program as "by far the most effective USIS operation in Finland."[435] Cultural diplomacy operations also included bringing American visitors (such as sports athletes and artists) to Finland. In these events, the USIS office often co-operated with the Finnish-American Society. The USIS also expanded its library activities and the supply of books to Finland in the 1950s. Hollywood films and rock and jazz music proved popular in Finland as well and strengthened American cultural influence in the country.[436]

The Fulbright Program was one significant channel for the transfer of American national park knowledge to Finland. One of the first grantees in the ASLA-program was the forestry scientist Peitsa Mikola, who traveled to Madison, Wisconsin, in July 1950. Mikola had always been interested in nature, and besides working as a researcher at the Forest Research Institute (and later at the University of Helsinki as a Professor of Forest Biology), Mikola was an eager conservationist. He had chosen the University of Wisconsin-Madison because of the university's excellence in his field. During his scholarship year in the United States, he also traveled widely across the country for research and leisure. When Mikola's wife visited him in the summer of 1951, they traveled around the country by car, including trips to several of America's national parks. As a forest biologist, Mikola was most impressed by the gigantic trees he saw in California.[437]

---

[434] Fields, *Reinforcing Finland's Attachment*, 200–209, 300–302.
[435] Ibid., 207. This opinion persisted: "From the American perspective, the ASLA-Fulbright programme remained their most effective channel to influence Finns of all ages throughout the 1960s." p. 334. See also p. 343, Fields notes that "The ASLA-Fulbright programme was also regarded as an excellent channel for having both direct and indirect impact on the development of Finnish politics as well as the modernisation of industry and business, rather than merely influencing the perceptions of individuals inside academia."
[436] Ibid., 209–215, 262–267.
[437] "Stipendiaattina 60 vuotta sitten: Professori Peitsa Mikolalle ASLA-stipendi oli ponnahduslauta laajaan kansainväliseen toimintaan," *Fulbright Center News* 1 (2010): 12–14.

Impressed by his travels in the American national parks, Mikola wrote to the U.S. National Park Service after returning to Finland. He thanked the NPS for the warm welcome he had received in various national parks and asked to receive printed materials about U.S. national parks: "At the present time, we are organizing the administration of the nature protection in Finland, and in this connection several new national parks will be established. I feel that in this task we would be helped greatly by any information about the American National Parks and Monuments and their administration."[438] Mikola received several pieces of material to assist in planning new national parks.[439]

After returning to Finland, Mikola also shared his knowledge of American national parks by giving public presentations and writing articles about them. In 1952, he gave a radio presentation about his travels to American national parks as part of a series of radio broadcasts that the Finnish Association for Nature Conservation organized in order "to keep in touch with members and at the same time of course to disseminate information about nature conservation."[440] He also wrote an article on nature conservation areas and their management in the United States for the Association's year book/magazine *Suomen Luonto* (*Finland's Nature*). While in the United States, Mikola had absorbed the mythology related to the creation of the first national park in the country, as he recounted the tale of the Washburn expedition of 1870 and how the members of the expedition, Cornelius Hedges especially, had had the foresight to come up with the idea of preserving Yellowstone as a national park. Mikola's article gave a very good description of the development of American national parks and other protected areas, their organization, and their management under the U.S. National Park Service—as well as the guiding principles of parks. Tourism in national parks was well-organized, although sometimes nature conservation was at odds with the demands of tourist travel. Mikola explained that conservationists had had to make

[438] Peitsa Mikola, Special Silviculturist, Forest Research Institute, to National Park Service, November 22, 1951, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2177, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Europe, 1951–61, NARA.

[439] Isabelle F. Story, Editor in Chief, to Mr. Peitsa Mikola, January 28, 1952, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2177, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Europe, 1951–61, NARA.

[440] Kertomus Suomen Luonnonsuojeluyhdistyksen toiminnasta v. 1952, p. 3, Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistyksen arkisto, 1 Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistys, Vuosikokousten pöytäkirjat 1938–1973, Folder: 170 Suomen luonnonsuojeluliiton arkisto, File: Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistys, Vuosikokousten pöytäkirjat 1947–1960, KA. "Tällä tavoin yhdistys toivoo voivansa pitää jatkuvaa kosketusta jäsenistöönsä ja samalla tietenkin levittää luonnonsuojelutietoutta."

certain compromises as "American travelers have great and sometimes peculiar demands."[441] No doubt these kinds of articles inspired conservation-minded readers and made American national parks a little more familiar to them. They also contributed to the attachment of the national park idea to the United States and transferred American park ideals to Finland. The USIS office in Helsinki, then, must have been pleased with these efforts. As Marek Fields has noted, returning grantees were an effective part of American cultural diplomacy, as "the testimony of Finns about what they had seen and learnt in the US would always make a deeper impression on their fellow Finns than anything the Americans might say about themselves."[442]

Information about the American national park idea was available and distributed in Finland at, for example, the Finnish Association for Nature Conservation's meetings and lectures. Already in 1946, the President of the Association and the former Government Counselor for Nature Conservation, Professor Vilho Kujala, gave a presentation with pictures about a visit to Yellowstone National Park to an audience of 180 association members.[443] A film about American national forests, which had been borrowed from the United States Information Service, was shown during the annual meeting in 1950, with 140 members present.[444] In 1961, the Association showed a film about Yellowstone in a meeting for foresters.[445] In 1967, Assistant Government Counselor for Nature Conservation, Antti Haapanen, who had returned from a Fulbright scholarship year in the U.S. and had participated in one of the Short Courses on the Management of National Parks and Equivalent Reserves, gave a

[441] Peitsa Mikola, "Yhdysvaltain luonnonsuojelualueista ja niiden hallinnosta," *Suomen Luonto*: Suomen luonnonsuojelun vuosikirja (1952): 33–45. Quote from p. 41. "[A]merikkalaisella matkailijalla on suuret ja välistä omituiset vaatimukset."
[442] Fields, *Reinforcing Finland's Attachment*, 203–208. Quote from p. 208.
[443] Vuosikokouksen pöytäkirja 7.4.1946, Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistyksen arkisto, 1 Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistys, Vuosikokousten pöytäkirjat 1938–1973, Folder: 170 Suomen luonnonsuojeluliiton arkisto, File: Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistys, Perustavan kokouksen pöytäkirja 1938, Vuosikokouspöytäkirjat 1939–1946, KA.
[444] Vuosikokouksen pöytäkirja 26.3.1950, Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistyksen arkisto, 1 Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistys, Vuosikokousten pöytäkirjat 1938–1973, Folder: 170 Suomen luonnonsuojeluliiton arkisto, File: Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistys, Vuosikokousten pöytäkirjat 1947–1960, KA.
[445] Vuosikokouksen pöytäkirja 19.3.1961, p. 3, Esitelmätoiminta, Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistyksen arkisto, 1 Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistys, Vuosikokousten pöytäkirjat 1938–1973, Folder: 170 Suomen luonnonsuojeluliiton arkisto, File: Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistys, Vuosikokousten pöytäkirjat 1961–1973, KA.

lecture with color images about national parks in the United States.[446] The Association also received information about American national parks through other channels. For example, as it was a member of the IUCN, it received a set of issues of the National Parks Association's publication *National Parks Magazine*, which were distributed in co-operation with the United States Information Agency. "We thought these magazines might be useful to you in your own efforts in [sic] behalf of the protection of nature and that you might like to learn through them something of the interest the people of the United States are taking in their national parks, wildlife refuges, and other conservation programs," the NPA wrote.[447] Though only a small sample of the collaborative activities linking the two countries in matters of conservation, the examples demonstrate the range of activities and information available. One notable topic here is the showing of films about American nature. These films were ideal because they could not be accused of political content, yet they still managed to promote the positive way in which Americans enjoyed the country's nature.[448]

Finland's connections to the American national park idea were bolstered by organized international and American park programs such as the world conferences on national parks and the short courses on the administration of national parks and equivalent reserves, which many Finnish conservation and national park officials attended. The First World Conference on National Parks was held in Seattle, Washington, in June-July 1962. Reino Kalliola participated in the conference as Finland's representative. Kalliola's 1962 report on national parks in Finland, sent to the United States for the conference, began with the familiar account of Nordenskiöld's proposal for the establishment of national parks in the Nordic countries. In his 1953 report to the IUPN on the national park concept in Finland, Kalliola had noted its leaning more towards the concept of strict reserve. In 1962, however, Kalliola wrote that Finland's national park areas "fully correspond to the international concept of a National Park (as it was stated e.g. in the London conference of 1933 …)." Kalliola

[446] Vuosikokouksen pöytäkirja 26.2.1967, Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistyksen arkisto, 1 Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistys, Vuosikokousten pöytäkirjat 1938–1973, Folder: 170 Suomen luonnonsuojeluliiton arkisto, File: Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistys, Vuosikokousten pöytäkirjat 1961–1973, KA.
[447] Fred M. Packard, Executive Secretary, National Parks Association, to the member societies of the International Union for Conservation, December 11, 1957, Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistyksen arkisto, 10 Kirjeenvaihto (1957–1958), Folder: 178 Suomen luonnonsuojeluliiton arkisto, File: Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistys, Kirjeenvaihto 1957 M-Ö, KA.
[448] Fields, *Reinforcing Finland's Attachment*, 221–222.

might have said "international," but his report is suggestive that his description of parks was influenced specifically by the *American* concept of national parks. Kalliola's report contained a fairly American-style description of the contradiction of national parks as preserving nature and encouraging tourist use. He described national parks as "public displays of the Finnish nature" and mentioned that tourist facilities had been built in national parks.[449]

Kalliola noted that national parks were not as important in Finland as in many other countries, as natural features in their natural condition could still be found in many places outside of national parks. This was changing, however. Nature reserves and national parks were also very important for scientific research, and Kalliola devoted some attention to describing research activities in the parks. His report perhaps slightly exaggerated the importance of tourism for national parks and their facilities, as the description gave the impression of good facilities and grand resorts. The report mentioned that, "To tourists arriving from the densely populated countries in Europe, the national parks in Lapland offer an incomparable experience." This tourist appeal might have been true in the selected few national parks of Northern Finland that Kalliola singled out. He did mention, however, that due to the sparse population of the areas, national parks did not have so great social function as recreational areas as in other countries. He wrote that "national parks have been established primarily as public showcases of Finnish nature and they are therefore open to tourists and wanderers," continuing that "Both the national parks and nature parks are totally protected [with some exceptions] and they represent virgin nature." He also described the conflict tourist facilities sometimes created for the preservationist purpose.[450]

In general, however, Finnish national parks were not great tourist destinations at this time, despite Kalliola's assurances. For example, in 1967 one potential foreign visitor received a reply from Finnish park authorities, who regretfully informed him that he was "expecting too much about our parks." It was then explained to him that Finland's national parks did not have very much to offer: visitor numbers were low, there were only a few national park staff members—not all parks even had a

[449] Suomen raportit: "National parks and equivalent reserves in Finland: A report to the First World Conference on National Parks, Seattle, Washington, U.S.A., June 30–July 7, 1962 by Reino Kalliola, Dr. phil., Government Counselor for Conservation of Nature," Folder: Seattle 1962, Valtion luonnonsuojeluvalvojan arkisto, YM. Quotes from p. 2.
[450] Ibid., quotes from pp. 7 and 9.

staff member—and only some parks had hotel accommodation available. There would be a lot of nature but only very few people and even smaller number of practical facilities.[451] On the park situation in the 1950s, one park official noted, "One was free to visit national parks, if one followed the park regulations—granted that one found them or even the park in the first place."[452]

Perhaps it had become important that Finnish parks were likened to those in the United States, and that is why Kalliola wrote about their tourist facilities in the way he did. He highlighted the creation of national parks for the public. Kalliola's mention of tourists from abroad is also a prime example of how national parks were of international importance—or at least were argued to be. In the 1950s and early 1960s, the national origin of parks was still stressed in reports. The Finnish idea of national parks, however, as articulated in these reports, was moving towards American ideas. This can be seen in the readiness to liken the Finnish parks to the American model, by highlighting similar problems and the tourism function, even though neither was a great issue in Finnish national parks. The national parks that were created in 1956 as well as the general situation in the country's national parks were far more focused on preservation than on active development.

After his trip, Kalliola described the contradictions within the national park concept that derived from the dual purpose of national parks in preserving nature in an area where a maximum number of visitors were expected and practical solutions to such a dilemma. He considered the experiences and materials gathered from his month-long trip to the United States as very beneficial for the development of national parks in Finland.[453] The dual mandate of national parks in its American (and Canadian) articulation or the problems it caused for national parks had not really been apparent in early Finnish proposals for or definitions of national parks before the 1960s. While both the preservation of nature and its recreational use were mentioned and considered

[451] Antti Haapanen, Assistant Government Counselor for the Conservation of Nature, to Mr. P. A. Brick, Head Warden, Pembrokeshire National Park, Great Britain, 26 September 1967, Folder: Lähteneet kirjeet 1967, Valtion luonnonsuojeluvalvojan arkisto, YM.

[452] Matti Helminen, "Perämetsästä matkailukohteeksi vai päinvastoin? Kansallispuistojemme vaiheita," in *Kansallispuistojen juhlavuoden seminaari Kolilla 28.–29.10.1996*, ed. Timo Muhonen and Seija Sulonen, Metsäntutkimuslaitoksen tiedonantoja 718 (Joensuu: Metsäntutkimuslaitos, 1998), 8. "Kansallispuistossa sai käydä, kunhan noudatti annettua järjestyssääntöä, jos sellaisen tai edes koko puiston jostain löysi."

[453] Suomen raportit: Maatalousministeriölle 18.9.1962, Maatalousministeriön kirjelmä n:o 2303/21.3.1962. kansallispuistoja koskeva maailmankonferenssi Seattlessa., Folder: Seattle 1962, Valtion luonnonsuojeluvalvojan arkisto, YM.

important, they were not contrasted in the same way as the North American dual mandate did—very likely because the modest visitor numbers to Finnish national parks at this time did not threaten the protection of nature. It is likely that these American examples helped Finnish officials realize the dual purpose of parks and the dangers inherent in it, and that articulating the dual mandate of national parks was, if not directly learned from then at least influenced, by U.S. examples. Kalliola, however, was critical of some activities in American national parks, such as fishing, and he thought that Americans did not understand all national park problems because their national parks were so great in size.[454] Still, Kalliola thought that Finnish national parks were "just the same as f.eg. in USA and in Schweden [sic] and in Switzerland but not in England." In saying this, he wanted to highlight that Finland had created the "right kind" of national parks, along the lines of the American model.[455]

International examples and connections helped the development of national parks in Finland. They were also used as an argument in Finland. The Finnish Forest Research Institute insisted that Finnish participation to the Seattle conference of 1962 was important on the grounds of the great significance of participating in such uniting cultural work as nature conservation co-operation (Finland belonged, according to the Forest Research Institute's argument, to a group of "progressive countries" when it came to resolving the question of the establishment of national parks). The matters discussed at the First World Conference were especially important at the time because Finnish nature conservation legislation was in the process of being revised. It was mentioned that the conference included field trips to Yellowstone and other national parks in the U.S., which would provide ideal opportunities to observe problems related to the national park idea and their practical solutions.[456] However, it is important to note that the U.S. was not the only influence on Finnish thinking when it came to environmental concerns and growing environmental consciousness.[457]

---

[454] Handwritten notes, Folder: Seattle 1962, Valtion luonnonsuojeluvalvojan arkisto, YM.
[455] Reino Kalliola to Prof. N. Polunin, Switzerland, 13 August 1969, Folder: Lähteneet kirjeet 1969, Valtion luonnonsuojeluvalvojan arkisto, YM.
[456] Metsäntutkimuslaitos maatalousministeriölle 30.1.1962, Folder: Seattle 1962, Valtion luonnonsuojeluvalvojan arkisto, YM.
[457] For example, Tuomas Räsänen challenges the argument that Finnish environmental thinking and policies were influenced by American sources—Rachel Carson's 1962 book, Silent Spring, in particular—suggesting instead that Swedish scientific knowledge was a transformative influence in the 1960s and 1970s. See Tuomas Räsänen, "Converging Environmental Knowledge: Re-Evaluating the Birth of Modern Environmentalism in Finland," *Environment and History* 18, 2 (2012): 159–181.

The Second World Conference on National Parks in 1972 showed the national park idea as an American idea with Cold War connections even more clearly. Professor Peitsa Mikola and Government Counselor for Nature Conservation Pekka Borg participated in the conference as Finland's representatives. Eero-Pekka Paavolainen of the Finnish Association of Nature Conservation was also present at the conference. In their report, Mikola and Borg noted that the conference was divided into two parts: the first part included the centennial celebration of Yellowstone and sessions organized in that park, while the second part was the actual conference held in Grand Teton National Park, which was technical in nature and came up with recommendations for participating countries. The Yellowstone part focused mostly on American internal national park questions. Mikola and Borg were of the opinion that European concerns were not really addressed at the conference—rather, the conference focused very heavily on national park questions in the developing countries, to the extent that the Nordic participants felt like mere bystanders. Mikola and Borg explained that someone had even voiced a question about who was going to help Europe, as there had been so much discussion on the technical and economic aid provided to developing countries. This seems to highlight the park idea as an American export in the Cold War context.

In addition to discussions about the situation with national parks in developing countries, the Finnish representatives noted a focus on the tourist use of national parks and problems related to it. They suggested that Finland should take note of the solutions and not repeat the mistakes already made in some heavily used foreign parks in this regard. Mikola and Borg mostly mentioned examples from the situation in American national parks. All in all, they were of the opinion that European park problems were nearly completely forgotten, as most of the attention was given to matters relevant to developing countries or North American national parks. The latter part of Mikola and Borg's report focused on giving an overview of the two American national parks that had hosted the conference, no doubt with the hope that it would provide a useful comparison when thinking about the development of Finland's parks system.[458] That the aid given to developing countries for the creation of national parks

[458] "Selostus Maailman 2. kansallispuistokonferenssista Yellowstonen ja Grand Tetonin kansallispuistoissa USA:ssa 17–27.9.1972" [This report was sent from the Forest Research Institute's Nature Conservation office to various recipients, including several ministries, the State Board of Foresty, and numerous associations conneted to land use planning, travel, or nature conservation], Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistyksen arkisto, 13 Kirjeenvaihto (1946–1973), Folder: 180 Suomen

and North American problems with tourism were so overly stressed at the *World* Conference of National Parks—or that at least the Finnish participants felt they were—is perhaps a good example of the promotion of the national park idea as an American idea that was to be exported abroad and used as a tool to generate positive attention. It seems as if there was an expectation that this was the model to follow for all countries, and that the park idea was something to be exported to other countries with American leadership and aid through the conferences.

Besides participating in the actual national park programs (such as the short courses and world conferences), several Finnish officials went to the United States to learn about national parks and their management and were assisted by the NPS to be able to learn as much as they could during their visits to American parks. For example, Mr. E. J. Koppanen, an MP from Finland, visited Yosemite, Grand Canyon, Rocky Mountain, and Everglades National Parks, sponsored by the Governmental Affairs Institute. Gordon Fredine, Chief of the Division of International Affairs, wrote to the superintendents of the parks to inform them of the visits. "Mr. Koppanen is a forester, and is drafting laws and regulations on national parks and wildlife in Finland," Fredine explained.[459] Antti Haapanen, the Assistant Government Counselor for Nature Conservation, spent the entire month of June 1966 touring Western national parks, after attending the Short Course in Administration of National Parks and Equivalent Reserves in May 1966. Fredine informed the superintendents that in Finland, Haapanen was "directly concerned with a growing national parks and reserve system and is interested in obtaining information which will be useful in convincing his countrymen of the values of national parks." Haapanen was especially interested in wildlife management and bird species.[460]

Pekka Borg, the Government Counselor for Nature Conservation, was one of the Finnish park officials who participated in the International Short Courses (later

---

luonnonsuojeluliiton arkisto, File: Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistys, Valtion luonnonsuojeluvalvoja, Kirjeenvaihto 1946–1973, KA.

[459] C. Gordon Fredine, Chief of the Division of International Affairs, memos to Superintendent, Grand Canyon, March 3, 1965; Reginal Director, Western, March 3, 1965 (quote from this memo); Superintendent, Rocky Mountain, March 3, 1965; Superintendent, Everglades, February 23, 1965, RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2178, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Europe, 1962–69, NARA.

[460] C. Gordon Fredine memos to Superintendents, Grand Canyon, Yosemite, Grand Teton, Yellowstone, Glacier, May 31, 1966; and May 17, 1966 (quote from this memo), RG 79, Entry 11: Administrative Files, 1949–1971, Box 2178, File: L66 Foreign Parks and Historic Sites, Finland, 1966, NARA.

Seminars) on Administration of National Parks and Equivalent Reserves in North America. In his report to the Academy of Finland, which had financed his trip, Borg described the program and contents of the seminar and his impressions of it. Even though most of the course had focused on becoming familiar with the North American park systems and going through a program of park administration and management topics and field exercises, the participants (34 people from 27 countries, mostly outside Europe) had also had an opportunity to tell something about the parks and nature conservation problems in their own countries. "It is noteworthy that in almost every country represented by the course participants, there is a separate department for the administration and management of national parks as well as educated staff available. Finland's insufficient national park organization received negative attention once again," Borg wrote. Despite some practical problems Borg had noted during the course—such as the very tight schedule—he was definitely of the opinion that Finland should continue sending participants to the seminar, to make sure there would be enough internationally educated staff available for the development of the Finnish national park system. Borg thought that the Mexican part of the program was the least useful. His report included lengthy descriptions of the American, Canadian, and Mexican park systems as well as their current concerns and detailed reports on management of the specific parks he had visited during the seminar.[461]

It is clear that by making these international comparisons, showcasing the practices in foreign parks, and highlighting how far behind other countries Finland lagged, Borg was trying to appeal to Finnish institutions and politicians in order to achieve better management for national parks in Finland. In this task, relying on American experiences and arguments for national parks was especially important—even if also the many problems (such as ones created by large amounts of tourists) in American national parks were mentioned. American national parks were an important part of the "campaign" for national park development in Finland, and it is easy to see how the purpose of national parks and the arguments for the development of national

[461] "Selvitys Suomen Akatemialle matka-apurahan käytöstä. Matkakertomus / Pekka Borg: Kansallispuistohallinnon kurssi 6.8.-3.9.1975 (Tenth International Seminar on Administration of National Parks and Equivalent Reserves)" Folder: Kansallispuistot luonnoksia, Valtion luonnonsuojeluvalvojan arkisto, YM. "Merkillepantavaa on, että lähes kaikissa kurssilaisten käsittelemissä maissa kansallispuistojen hallintoa ja hoitoa varten on oma virastonsa ja koulutettu henkilökunta. Suomen puutteellinen puisto-organisaatio joutui taas kerran kiusallisen huomion kohteeksi." p. 3.

parks moved in the direction of American ideas. This can be seen in the Finnish arguments about the growing importance of tourism, the economic importance of national parks, and the need to balance the dual mandate guiding national parks.

In the early 1970s, Finland's national parks system was under scrutiny and development. A national park committee report from 1975 noted that when planning for the training of Finnish park officials and staff members, the U.S. National Park Service's "well-known courses" could be used as the model for developing educational programs and that Finnish park officials should be sent to participate in American and Canadian special courses.[462] Borg's observations also made their way into the national park committee report, which was released in 1976 and included a section describing the national parks systems in some foreign countries. The national park committee made thorough recommendations for the creation of nature protection areas.[463] A number of new parks were established in 1982. It has been suggested that Urho Kekkonen National Park—created in the early 1980s—was the first "American style" national park, with serious attention given to hiking possibilities.[464] Even though many of Finland's national parks were naturally quite small in size, they now reflected the American idea of large parks suited for recreation and tourism, as opposed to the early-20th-century German ideas.

4.3. Reinventing and Articulating the National Park Idea as an American Idea in Finland

The story of the creation of Yellowstone—and the national park model the U.S. (supposedly) had provided for the entire world—was so significant that it became influential abroad later, even in some countries where the U.S. had not originally influenced the national park idea, as was the case with Finland. From the 1960s onwards, the park idea was "Americanized" in Finland. This did not mean just the adoption of American technical knowledge about park management practices, but

[462] "Kansallispuistokomitea 18.11.1975. PM. Kansallispuistojen hallinto Suomessa ja eräissä muissa maissa," Folder: Kansallispuistot luonnoksia, Valtion luonnonsuojeluvalvojan arkisto, YM. Quote from p. 44.
[463] Kansallispuistokomitea, *Kansallispuistokomitean mietintö* (1976).
[464] Antti Parpola and Veijo Åberg, *Metsävaltio: Metsähallitus ja Suomi 1859–2009* (Helsinki: Edita, 2009), 348.

articulating the Finnish concept of national parks more along the American lines and attaching the creation of national parks in Finland to the Yellowstone creation story—as if all national parks had a common birth at Yellowstone.

While it is more interesting and important to examine how the national park idea become reinvented as an American idea in Finland through conservationists' international connections during the Cold War, it is also worth briefly noting that practical park management was influenced by American examples. Minttu Perttula, in a study published in the State Board of Forestry's publication series, interviewed four former nature conservation officials—Pekka Borg, Antti Haapanen, Matti Helminen, and Hannu Ormio—on how they modeled actual park management practices following American models. While one of the Finnish participants had felt there were some hidden political agendas, likely because the course (International Short Course on Administration of National Parks and Equivalent Reserves) was filled with participants from South America and Eastern Europe, another emphasized that the course had not marketed the American park model but rather the general benefits of national parks.[465] Even though Perttula's study is narrow—drawing its conclusions mostly from these few interviews—it is significant that, according to her, the officials very much felt that they were adapting American models to park planning and the day-to-day management of Finland's national parks.[466] Borg, Haapanen, Helminen, and Ormio held significant positions in the field of nature conservation and national park management and development in Finland and abroad. Haapanen and Helminen were also Fulbright grantees.[467] Perttula, however, does not view their work in the larger context of the Americanization of the park idea in Finland, as she focuses on how these officials brought new practices to Finland and quite likely overstresses their importance, as their American connections need to be seen as part of a bigger picture. She credits the

[465] Perttula, *Suomen kansallispuistojärjestelmän kehittyminen*, 44.
[466] Ibid. The study, based on master's thesis work, is mostly useful in voicing the opinions of these four officials and also grounding this perspective as one legitimized by the State Board of Forestry [Metsähallitus]. Perttula focuses only on the State Board of Forestry, missing the important conservationist tradition in the Forest Research Institute and the national parks administered by it, even though these two parks were the most similar to their American counterparts.
[467] Ibid., 12–14.

transfer of American park practices to "the unprejudiced attitude of Finnish conservation officials toward new ideas and practices."[468]

I would suggest that rather than the Finnish conservationists' personal characteristics, the transfer of national park practices was linked to the larger context of Cold War cultural links and conservation programs, which resulted in what I call the reinvention of the national park idea as an American idea in Finland. These officials were not bringing "new ideas" as such; rather, the American national park system was familiar to Finnish conservationists through earlier connections (and, as I have shown, contacts with the U.S. National Park Service existed already before the creation of national parks in Finland). No doubt the work of these particular officials was very important—but it was not a coincidence or merely the idea of a couple of officials that information should be sought from the United States, but instead needs to be seen more as an expected development, given the heavy American investment in and influence on national park co-operation and the promotion of the national park idea abroad. When considering American leadership in international park matters, it would have been quite unusual if the Finns had not looked to the U.S. for information. It is easy to understand that Finnish park officials went to the U.S. to learn about park management and adapted this knowledge once back in Finland when developing park facilities. But it is more difficult to explain why conservationists in Finland started to articulate the entire national park idea as an American invention.

Perttula's study, however, gives many good examples of how American practices were adapted to Finland's parks, and as such, it provides good information about the actual practical influence of the short courses and other information from the U.S. Despite considerable differences in the size and resources of the two national park systems, American examples clearly influenced Finnish park master plans, practical management (such as designs and organization of hiking routes) and interpretation and nature education, for example. Two points especially are significant here. First, that the four officials interviewed by Perttula wanted to stress the American experiences so much says a great deal about the positive impression they had gained of American park practices. While Perttula's account focuses heavily on the work of a couple of park

[468] Ibid., 7–8. "Suomalaisten luonnonsuojeluvirkamiesten ennakkoluuloton asenne uusia ajatuksia ja toimintatapoja kohtaan muodosti sillan erityisesti Suomen ja Pohjois-Amerikan välille. Tämä puolestaan johti 1960- ja 1970-luvulla konkreettisen opin hakemiseen Yhdysvalloista."

officials in adapting certain American practical management practices to Finnish parks and based on interviews with said officials, it is significant that they highlighted the impact American park programs in particular had on them and on their views of national parks and how to organize them in Finland. Secondly, that the State Board of Forestry published Perttula's study in its series in 2006 seems to suggest that the State Board of Forestry was happy with a narrative suggesting that many park practices of Finnish national parks derived rather directly from the United States.

What is even more remarkable than the transfer of American practical and technical knowledge to Finland and its influence on Finland's park management is the way in which the whole idea of national parks came to be seen as being of American origin and the purpose of national parks to be articulated in American terms. This is strongly connected to and demonstrates my larger argument according to which the national park idea was constructed as an American idea not at Yellowstone's establishment but only later—during the Cold War—and that at this time Yellowstone became adopted as the mythical origin for national parks worldwide, not just in the U.S.

A group of conservation experts with similar ideas published articles that connected the American national idea to Finnish national parks starting in the 1950s, but especially in the 1960s and 1970s. Many articles in *Suomen Luonto* [*Finland's Nature*, an influential conservation magazine read by conservationists and the general public] show how the park idea was treated as American intellectual property. The writers of these articles, who were leading conservation and park officials in Finland, thought that American national parks gave a suitable model of what national parks and their purpose ought to be and that these ideas should be followed in Finland. Even though *Suomen Luonto* contained articles on national parks and nature conservation in many other countries as well—such as East Germany, the Soviet Union, Poland, and Sweden for example—the amount of attention given to the United States and Yellowstone was notable.

Peitsa Mikola—one of the most prominent conservationists in Finland—had written an overview of the U.S. national park system for *Suomen Luonto* in 1952, as already mentioned when discussing his Fulbright scholarship to the U.S. The next year, Reino Kalliola—the Government Counselor for the Conservation of Nature, whose work in reporting Finnish park matters to an international conservation organization I

have already discussed at some length—wrote in the foreword of the magazine about the purposes of nature preservation, suggesting that nature preservation as an idea was not well enough known, but that it consisted of three main points: economic, cultural, and social. He noted that it was an American idea to include economic reasons in nature preservation, in addition to cultural and social motives. Kalliola explained that in the U.S., the destruction of nature and the negative economic impact of this had been experienced more than in Europe, but that these should be noted.[469] The whole idea of nature protection was coming closer to international definitions. The United States wanted to promote the park idea by stressing its economic importance as well as the cultural and preservationist values embedded within park idea. This point was made quite often in Finland.

In 1954, Kalliola also wrote about the connections between nature protection and tourism and outdoor recreation, noting that "In the best case, nature protection can be a very profitable 'business' for some areas and for the whole nation. For example, Yellowstone and other large national parks in the USA as well as Kruger National Park in South Africa have proven this." He quoted visitor numbers for Yellowstone (1.35 million in 1952) and noted the economic importance of the park's tourism to the United States. While Kalliola acknowledged the dangers of too much tourist use of national parks—again referring to Yellowstone and its problems that stemmed from tourism—and cautioned against too much development, all in all he considered thinking about tourism and outdoor recreation beneficial for national parks. He echoed the North American sentiment that only such activities and facilities that are needed in order for visitors to experience nature would be tolerated.[470]

It was this economic point, demonstrated by American national parks, that was willingly employed by Finnish conservationists eager to achieve better preservationist measures in their country. It was about time that Finland realized the prospects of park tourism, in their opinion. It also shows the influence of the United States in defining the purpose of national parks: even if tourism had not been an important justification or purpose for creating national parks in all countries, it could be

[469] Reino Kalliola, "Alkusanat," *Suomen Luonto*: Suomen luonnonsuojelun vuosikirja (1953): 5–8.
[470] Reino Kalliola, "Matkailu ja retkeily luonnonsuojelun näkökulmasta," *Suomen Luonto*: Suomen luonnonsuojelun vuosikirja (1954): 9–22. Quote from p. 11: "Suotuisimmillaan luonnonsuojelu voi olla tietyille seuduille ja koko kansakunnalle hyvin tuottava 'business'. Sen ovat esim. Yellowstone ja muut USA:n suuret kansallispuistot sekä Krügerin kansallispuisto Etelä-Afrikassa osoittaneet."

adopted as such, following American models and using the U.S. as a case for argumentation. The economic value of national parks to Finland was argued and backed up with the help of American examples, for example. American parks also served as examples of what to avoid (too much tourist traffic). Yellowstone was viewed as a preservationist and an economic model. All in all, Yellowstone and American national parks were the models to which national park development was compared and referred to.

Titled "For the benefit and enjoyment of the people: on national parks in the U.S.A.," Government Counselor for the Conservation of Nature Reino Kalliola's 1963 article on American national parks began with the well-known, glorified account of the birth of the national park idea at Yellowstone. He, however, mentioned that this was only the standard account explained to those who did not wish to know more about the matter and that setting aside the first national park had been a more complex story, one involving careful planning, suitable cultural politics, and good timing. Kalliola explained that of course the national park idea had not been born at the Madison Junction campfire but that the roots of the idea were in Europe, where the idea could not have been realized. "It [the national park idea] was America's contribution, gift and example to the whole rest of the world," he concluded. Kalliola went on to explain that it was only natural that there was a field trip organized in conjunction with the First World Conference on National Parks (held in Seattle in the summer of 1962) to Yellowstone since it was the largest and most well-known of the national parks in the United States. The rest of Kalliola's article consisted of his impressions of the park. He was sure to point out how well travel and recreation had been organized in the park, especially the provision of information and educative materials for visitors. Again, Kalliola noted that only such facilities that were necessary for experiencing the park's nature were permitted. His very positive description of Yellowstone and its conditions noted one grave problem though: sports fishing. Kalliola also made a brief mention of the other parks he had visited and provided a brief summary of how the national park system (and other units of nature protection) was organized in the U.S.[471] This article drew from Kalliola's visit to the First World Conference. These kinds of personal visits

[471] Reino Kalliola, "Koko kansan hyödyksi ja iloksi: USA:n kansallispuistoista," *Suomen Luonto* 2 (1963): 111–119. Quote from p. 112. "Se oli Amerikan anti, lahja ja esimerkki koko muulle maailmalle."

were very important for transmitting American park ideals to Finland, as the knowledge was then shared.

In 1965, Antti Haapanen, whose American park connections have already been mentioned, wrote that Yosemite and Yellowstone were among the first notable achievements in the field of nature protection, which he explained as consisting of the protection of representative examples of original nature. After noting these American examples, Haapanen mentioned Nordenskiöld's similar ideas. He then went on to describe the active management measures needed for preserving nature. Haapanen's text is a great example of articles that first noted the preservationist advances made abroad and then contrasted them to the situation in Finland.[472] The next year, Haapanen wrote about nature preservation in the United States, following his time as a Fulbright grantee. His article described the efficient work that was being done across the Atlantic and the variety of initiatives and measures by groups and individuals concerned with nature preservation, clearly with the hope that this could serve as an example in Finland.[473] In 1970, Hannu Ormio, yet another Finnish conservation official familiar with American national parks, was straightforward in noting that Finland should look at what was happening in American and Canadian national parks, as they were ahead of Finland in park development. Too much development and tourist use of national park areas had the potential for significant damage. The article was based on Ormio's travels in American national parks. "Based on American experiences, we can draw conclusions that fit Finland's conditions as well," Ormio argued.[474] To warn Finns about this possibility seemed almost too cautious, as Finland's park development was nowhere near this level of development, but again this was a way to liken Finnish parks to those in the U.S.

Yellowstone was the model for national parks worldwide and its centennial in 1972 was prominently noted. It was explained that the location for the 1972 World Conference on National Parks had been selected to honor the first national park of the world. Even though there were now so many national parks or equivalent reserves around the world, other countries still looked to the U.S. for a model.

[472] Antti Haapanen, "Alkuperäisen luonnon suojelu," *Suomen Luonto* 1 (1965): 8–16.
[473] Antti Haapanen, "Luonnonsuojeluvaikutelmia Yhdysvalloista," *Suomen Luonto* 3 (1966): 75–77.
[474] Hannu Ormio, "Paine kasvaa USA:n kansallispuistoihin," *Suomen Luonto* 5-6 (1970): 170–172. Quote from p. 172. "Amerikkalaisten saamista kokemuksista voitaneen tehdä Suomenkin oloihin soveltuvia päätelmiä."

"Yellowstone, with its geysers, bears, and various recreational facilities, is still a kind of a model of a national park for the rest of the world, even if its incredible popularity has already endangered the nature that the park is trying to preserve," it was noted in an article that mainly focused on the insufficient progress made in Finland regarding the establishment of nature preservation areas.[475] Reino Kalliola examined the concept of a national park, acknowledging some of the great variations in it across the globe, but tracking the origin of the idea to the United States:

> It is known that the national park idea has originated in the USA exactly one hundred years ago (the establishment of Yellowstone park in 1872). The purpose is to preserve nature "for the benefit and enjoyment of the people." This principle has indeed been carefully followed not only in America, but for example in Switzerland and in all the Nordic countries.[476]

Kalliola therefore credited the U.S. with the first national park and with being the model for national parks in other countries. Conwentz's ideas were mentioned nowhere. He also urged the State Board of Forestry and the Forest Research Institute to send participants to American park conferences and courses.[477] Hannu Ormio complained about the lack of management in Finnish parks, mentioning only one American example—but his description of the suitable management practices for national parks was clearly influenced by those implemented by the U.S. NPS, as he had been in the U.S. to observe park management practices.[478] Again, the articles used comparisons to American parks as a way to argue for the need for positive park developments in Finland. It is also clear that by time of the Yellowstone centennial, the national park idea had been accepted as an American invention and Yellowstone recognized as the mythical first park in the world in the Finnish discussion of national parks. This was no

[475] Teuvo Suominen, "Luonnonsuojelualueittemme alennustila," *Suomen Luonto* 4 (1972): 114–115. Quote from p. 114. "Yhä edelleen Yellowstone kuumine lähteineen, karhuineen ja monenlaisine virkistyspalveluineen on muun maailman silmissä eräänlainen kansallispuiston esikuva, vaikka sen tavaton suosio on jo vaarantanut sen, mitä se luonnonsuojelualueena koettaa suojella."
[476] Reino Kalliola, "Erilaiset luonnonsuojelualueet," *Suomen Luonto* 4 (1972): 116–120. Quote from p. 117. "Kansallispuisto-käsite on tunnetusti saanut alkunsa USA:ssa tasan sata vuotta sitten (Yellowstonen puiton [sic] perustaminen v. 1872). Tarkoituksena on luonnon koskemattomuuden säilyttäminen 'koko kansan hyödyksi ja iloksi'. Tätä periaatetta onkin tarkoin seurattu paitsi Amerikassa esim. Sveitsissä ja kaikissa Pohjoismaissa."
[477] Reino Kalliola, "Erilaiset luonnonsuojelualueet," *Suomen Luonto* 4 (1972): 116–120.
[478] Hannu Ormio, "Missä viipyy kansallispuistojen hoito," *Suomen Luonto* 4 (1972): 121–123.

doubt thanks to the active international park work and narratives that recounted the origin myth of Yellowstone at the Madison Junction campfire.

Eero-Pekka Paavolainen—who was present at the 1972 conference—wrote an article entitled "Yellowstone National Park 100 Years" that discussed the park, its history, and the management of the U.S. national park system, and in which he recounted the myth of the evening campfire as the origin of the world's first national park. Despite the problems deriving from heavy tourist use of the areas, Paavolainen sent greetings to Finland on how to manage parks and their tourism, based on experiences in the large parks of the U.S. and Canada.[479] Reino Kalliola criticized the State Board of Forestry for its management of Finland's national parks. He mentioned that it was "a public secret" that some State Board of Forestry officials had observed the forest cutting practices of Tatra National Park (at the border of Poland and Czechoslovakia) and thought that the same could be done in Finnish national parks as well. Kalliola considered the essence of national parks and wrote:

> Instead of traveling to the USA, where the national park idea was born, this unfortunate Central European experience was fixed in the minds of the directors in the State Board of Forestry and led them down the wrong path. After all, it is a matter of fact that a national park means the total preservation of nature in the way it was originally initiated in the USA. Yellowstone was established there in 1872 and they just held its 100th birthday celebration and congress in America. Representatives from Finland were present, but according to my knowledge, unfortunately no one from the State Board of Forestry. This American preservation idea – that a national park is preserved untouched – has been realized also in Switzerland and all the Nordic countries. On the other hand, there are various kinds of areas under the name of "national park." In England, for example, there are national parks that we would view as ordinary peaceful countryside.[480]

[479] Eero-Pekka Paavolainen, "Yellowstone National Park 100 vuotta," *Suomen Luonto* 2 (1973): 70–74.
[480] Reino Kalliola, "Vanhojen metsien asema ja merkitys: Kansallispuistojen metsät," *Suomen Luonto* 2 (1973): 76–77. Quotes from p. 76. "Sen sijaan että metsähallituksen johtajat olisivat tehneet matkansa USA:han, missä kansallispuistoajatus on saanut alkunsa, tämä onneton Keski-Euroopan kokemus juurtui heidän mieleensä ja johti heidät väärille jäljille. Asia on kuitenkin sillä tavalla, että kansallispuisto

He then went on to note that national parks were simply not just recreational areas, but representative examples of natural conditions. Therefore, Pyhä-Häkki, consisting of old-growth forests, which had been criticized as being too depressing and dark, was a prime attraction that should be preserved as an educative example of primeval forest.[481] Kalliola was of the opinion that national park organization in Finland should follow American models, as the national park idea had been born there.

It was not the State Board of Forestry that understood and constructed parks as an American invention, but the conservationists who had experience of American national parks. The conservationists' points influenced park reports and other articulations of national parks. Despite the problems of heavy tourist traffic in American national parks, Yellowstone was the model for the rest of the world, a model praised for its efforts at nature preservation. American parks were used as examples in times of great difficulties in park development in Finland. Finland was perhaps criticized by conservationists for the opposite development than the U.S.—for not developing national parks at all[482]—and the State Board of Forestry was repeatedly criticized for the way it handled national park matters.

"In 1880, the national park idea was brought to our country almost right after its inception – only a few years after the establishment of the world's first national park, Yellowstone in the United States. In Finland, the idea was sparked by A. E. Nordenskiöld…"[483] it read on the inside cover of the fifth issue of the year 1980 of *Suomen Luonto*. The issue contained an article on Nordenskiöld by Martti Blåfield to mark the occasion that it was "exactly 100 years since the well-known scientist and explorer of the Northwest Passage, A. E. Nordenskiöld, brought the national park idea

---

merkitsee luonnon täydellistä koskemattomuutta sillä tavalla kuin se on USA:ssa alunperin syntynyt. Siellähän v. 1872 perustettiin Yellowstone ja juuri vuosi sitten pidettiin sen 100-vuotisjuhlat ja kongressit Amerikassa. Suomestakin oli siellä edustajia, valitettavasti tietääkseni ei ketään metsähallituksesta. Tämä amerikkalainen luonnonsuojeluajatus – että kansallispuisto säilytetään täysin koskemattomana – on toteutettu myöskin Sveitsissä ja kaikissa Pohjoismaissa. Sen sijaan kansallispuiston nimellä on todella hyvinkin eriasteisia alueita. Englannissa esimerkiksi on kansallispuistoja, jotka meikäläisen käsityksen mukaan ovat tavallista rauhallista maaseutua."

[481] Ibid.

[482] Borg and Ormio, *Perustiedot kansallispuistoista*, 11, explains that many countries made the same mistakes of overdevelopment for tourism, but that in Finland "national park policy was directed to the other extreme."

[483] *Suomen Luonto* 5 (1980): 212. "Vuonna 1880 kansallispuistoaate tuotiin maahamme melkein verekseltään – vain muutamaa vuotta aikaisemmin oli perustettu maailman ensimmäinen kansallispuisto, Yhdysvaltojen Yellowstone. Aatteen viritti Suomessa A. E. Nordenskiöld …"

to our country with his writing in Per Brahes minne magazine," [484] as if to suggest that the national park idea was something that had been *brought* to Finland, not *originated* there (or in Nordenskiöld's thoughts for the Nordic countries). Previously it had been noted that Nordenskiöld was the first to propose parks in the Nordic countries, now he had *brought* the national park idea to the Nordic countries. Even though Nordenskiöld's role in proposing national parks for the Nordic countries was retained, the small difference seems relevant. Now, he had *brought* the idea only a short time after Yellowstone, in contrast to the earlier accounts hinting that the idea had *originated* with him, regardless of Yellowstone. While the early 20th-century conservationists in Finland had named Nordenskiöld as a great figure in the country's conservation history, this story was now directly connected to the American national park idea and made a transnational one. So, in the early 20th century Nordenskiöld had been credited with proposing parks for Finland, and while Yellowstone national park was known in the country, it had not really been connected to Nordenskiöld. The national parks of Finland had a *national* creation story. In the 1960s and 1970s, the park idea started to become articulated as an American idea that was applied to Finland. The 1980 article is notable in that even if it noted Nordenskiöld as "the father of our country's national park idea" and wished to celebrate Nordenskiöld and his proposal of 1880 for the creation of national parks in the Nordic countries, the park idea was ultimately connected to Yellowstone, and Nordenskiöld's achievement seemed more about how quickly after Yellowstone the national park idea had spread to the Nordic countries, not so much about the suggestion of creating parks for Nordic countries in itself.

Pekka Borg and Hannu Ormio's 1978 book on the ideals and management of national parks—mentioned in the introduction of the study—is another fitting example of the adoption of the Yellowstone story. While the early 20th-century conservationists (such as Palmgren) had written about national parks, they had described nature conservation and national parks as something all civilized nations had—however, not really a coherent movement that spread from somewhere. Now, under the heading "The national park idea spreads," Borg and Ormio wrote that "after the establishment of Yellowstone, the national park idea started to spread also to other

[484] Martti Blåfield, "A. E. Nordenskiöld ja kansallispuistoaate," *Suomen Luonto* 5 (1980): 219–222. Quotes from p. 219 and 222. "Tasan sata vuotta sitten maineikas tiedemies ja Koillisväylän löytäjä A. E. Nordenskiöld toi kansallispuistoaatteen maahamme kirjoituksellaan Per Brahes minne-lehdessä."

countries." They noted that some nature protection areas had already existed in Europe, but after the establishment of Yellowstone there started to be discussion about creating national parks. Borg and Ormio described this development, and while noting the influence of Hugo Conwentz on nature conservation in Finland, they highlighted that there were differences in the North American and Central European national park developments.[485] It is interesting that the park idea was now understood—or at least portrayed—as having spread from the U.S. This was in contrast with the earlier park arguments in Finland, which had focused on how the national park idea came from Nordenskiöld's proposal and how foreign models did not necessarily fit Finland—and even if model was to be taken from abroad, it was Scandinavia or Germany that provided suitable models.

Even though the U.S. National Park Service had seriously questioned the suitability of recounting the famous narrative of the origins of Yellowstone before the centennial of the park in 1972 [as we saw in chapter 3], for the obvious problems with the credibility of attributing the idea of preserving Yellowstone to Cornelius Hedges, this account of Yellowstone's mythical creation was told in detail as part of Borg and Ormio's lengthy introduction on the establishment of national parks in the United States. After detailing the birth of the park idea, Borg and Ormio included a chapter outlining international national park work, before turning to examples of national parks in four countries (United States—which they dealt with the most—, the Soviet Union, Poland, and Sweden). After Borg and Ormio's introduction, Finnish reader became perhaps even unnecessarily knowledgeable about, for example, the work of the first Director of the U.S. National Park Service, Stephen T. Mather.[486] The main point to be drawn from this is how much attention the authors devoted to describing the creation of Yellowstone, the American park organization, and management practices in a book that was actually about Finland's national parks and meant to provide accurate information to help the discussion concerning Finnish national parks as well as serve as a guide book for travelers, politicians, and friends of nature and provide educational material for studies.

---

[485] Borg and Ormio, *Perustiedot kansallispuistoista,* 11–13. Quote from p. 11. "Yellowstonen perustamisen jälkeen kansallispuistoaate alkoi levitä myös muihin maihin."
[486] Ibid., 6–41.

In the early 1900s, German and Scandinavian nature conservation models had been considered suitable for application in Finland, including the ideas and models for national parks. By the 1960s, it was clear that the United States had replaced other countries as the model. This is not to say that Finns did not have connections to other countries or influences from other places; Sweden especially was often referenced when thinking about suitable organizational measures for nature conservation in Finland, and lectures, film screenings, and articles introduced the national parks and nature conservation measures of many different countries to Finnish audiences. Sweden was a natural example. The IUCN meetings and other international conservation meetings were attended by Finnish officials and conservationists. The U.S. was just the most important—or the most heavily promoted influence—as at least *the national park idea* was heavily connected to U.S. models.

The national park idea became one of American cultural inventions that was adopted during the Cold War, even if the U.S. had not been considered a suitable conservation model before. This shows how the national park was constructed as an American idea even if it was not one previously. Experiences with American parks enabled Finnish conservationists to use them to argue in favor of establishing additional Finnish national parks and for better conditions for national parks. Finland was to be a civilized nation with national parks. American examples and experiences were now considered suitable for application in Finland—perhaps as one way of painting a picture of being a modern nation like the U.S., with national parks along similar lines. Differences in nature, size, or economy did not matter anymore, and the Nordic countries were not the only or the most suitable examples any longer as the U.S. was deemed a better model.

Experiences from the United States were used to promote national parks in Finland, and even grant applications quoted American experiences. For example, the Finnish Association for Nature Conservation employed American national parks and park ideals as good examples and an argumentative means when suggesting that the establishment and development of Finnish national parks should be done in a certain manner. In 1967, the Finnish Association for Nature Conservation had compiled a proposal for the State Board of Forestry in order to argue for the need for a large national park in Eastern Lapland. Their report argued that the proposed park had the

potential to be "Europe's Yellowstone." It "could be advertised as the largest wilderness area in Western Europe," they noted. The proposal described this as the last chance to preserve a large enough wilderness area for nature recreation and mentioned that it could be kept roadless.[487] The Association also delivered a letter to the IUCN, in order to ask their Russian colleagues whether a similar park area could be established in the Soviet Union, so that the two parks would together form an area "the size of Yellowstone in the United States."[488] One can only wonder how much this oddly familiar articulation about the urgency of preserving the last remaining sizable wilderness areas relied on American argumentation regarding national parks in Alaska, where it was considered the last chance to preserve wilderness in the U.S. It is interesting how this American ideal of and argumentation for large, untouched wilderness parks was adopted in Finland as well, and that Yellowstone—despite its tourism problems—was seen as a *preservationist* model.

In evaluating the merits of a proposal for organizing outdoor recreation for the Finnish Ministry of the Interior, upon the request of the Recreational Areas Committee, the Finnish Association for Nature Conservation quoted American experiences in its letter. The Association considered it important that one large national park be created in Northern Finland that would preserve the original wilderness for outdoor enthusiasts. Experiences from the United States confirmed the benefits of these kinds of areas for society, explained the letter, offering some examples of visitor numbers from American national parks.[489] It is interesting that, despite the huge differences in park systems, visitor numbers, and societal conditions in general, knowledge about American national parks and the personal experiences of their

[487] "Itä-Lapin kansallispuisto" (liite 1, pöytäkirja Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistyksen hallituksen kokouksesta 30.3.1967), Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistyksen arkisto, 4 Johtokunnan pöytäkirjat (1957–1967), Folder: 173 Suomen luonnonsuojeluliiton arkisto, File: Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistys, Johtokunnan/hallituksen pöytäkirjat 1967, KA. "Sompion – Saariselän – Nuortijoen kansallispuistoa voitaisiin mainostaa läntisen Euroopan suurimpana erämaana, joka yli 5500 km2:n laajuisena olisi 'Euroopan Yellowstone'."

[488] Suomenkielinen jäljennös kirjeestä, joka oli tarkoitettu annettavaksi Neuvostoliiton edustajalle IUCN:n kokouksessa 1967 (liite 3, pöytäkirja Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistyksen hallituksen kokouksesta 30.3.1967), Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistyksen arkisto, 4 Johtokunnan pöytäkirjat (1957–1967), Folder: 173 Suomen luonnonsuojeluliiton arkisto, File: Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistys, Johtokunnan/hallituksen pöytäkirjat 1967, KA.

[489] "Asia: Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistyksen lausunto Ulkoilulakikomitean mietinnöstä, Viite: Sisäasiainministeriön kirjelmä N:o 1531/070/67" (17.6.1967 liite 2, pöytäkirja Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistyksen hallituksen kokouksesta 23.5.1967), Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistyksen arkisto, 4 Johtokunnan pöytäkirjat (1957–1967), Folder: 173 Suomen luonnonsuojeluliiton arkisto, File: Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistys, Johtokunnan/hallituksen pöytäkirjat 1967, KA.

management helped Finnish conservationists in utilizing American park ideals as arguments for improving Finland's national park system. Even scientific research grant applications, such as the one by the Finnish Association for Nature Conservation, which focused on examining the economic value of national parks in Northern Finland, referred to American experiences in outdoor recreation and park visitor numbers,[490] as if these were relevant to Finland. A point about the economic importance of national parks was put forward in these applications—an argument that without a doubt relied heavily on American examples.

Finland's national parks were important not only to Finland. The national park proposals now more prominently also argued for the benefits of Finnish parks to Europe at large by suggesting that tourists from abroad would come to see large wilderness areas still intact in Finland. Reino Kalliola wrote, in support of the Association's grant application to the Finnish Cultural Foundation, of the wonderful experience large national parks in Finland would provide to tourists from Europe. He considered the establishment of such parks as one way in which Finland could "draw positive attention on us from around the world."[491] This is a great example of how the national park idea was a product of transnational development and how the international dimension of national parks could be used to try to help to achieve national goals. National parks were not just "national" but international as well.

Finnish conservationists were eager to adopt the international ideal of national parks, the American national park idea, as this was something that could be used on the national level to make political leaders realize the benefits of nature conservation. American ideas were worth considering and the American concern over disappearing wilderness should be taken seriously. As Leo J. Salo put it in an article on wilderness areas in American national parks:

---

[490] "Suomen Luonnonvarain Tutkimussäätiölle 17.1.1968 jätetty apuraha-anomus, Perustelut apurahan saamiseksi," Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistyksen arkisto, 5 Hallituksen pöytäkirjat (1968–1976), Folder: 174 Suomen luonnonsuojeluliiton arkisto, File: Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistys, Hallituksen pöytäkirjat 1968/I, KA.

[491] Reino Kalliola Suomen Kulttuurirahaston hallitukselle 14.1.1968, Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistyksen apuraha-anomus, Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistyksen arkisto, 5 Hallituksen pöytäkirjat (1968–1976), Folder: 174 Suomen luonnonsuojeluliiton arkisto, File: Suomen luonnonsuojeluyhdistys, Hallituksen pöytäkirjat 1968/I, KA. "On täysi syy kysyä, eikö juuri suurten kansallispuistojen perustaminen Pohjois-Suomeen ole yksi niitä laajan, mutta harvaan asutun maan mahdollisuuksia, joilla voimme kiinnittää suuren maailman myönteisen huomion puoleemme." The possible benefit of the establishment of large national parks in Lapland to European tourists was mentioned already in the 1952 national park report.

> From a European perspective, it might feel like the American wilderness movement is a little exaggerated. Still, it is worth remembering that in Europe, primeval nature was slowly lost during a much longer period of time. Its disappearance happened almost unnoticeably. In North America, all of this happened in 200 years. Even if the destruction was fast, its current counter reaction – "to preserve the little that is left" – is equally strong. Perhaps we Finns, who claim to possess "Europe's last wilderness areas," could learn from this a little.[492]

Defining the ever-changing balance between preservation and use has been at the heart of the American national park idea since its inception. In Finland, since national park creation relied on different models at the beginning of the parks system and the actual development of national parks was very modest, scientific and preservationist viewpoints were dominant, and while national parks were meant to be used too, there were not many active measures to organize tourism in such places. It is interesting how Finnish conservationists started to write about tourism in American national parks to promote the benefits of tourism but also to caution against overdevelopment. Here, Finnish national parks were likened to their American counterparts by adopting the dual mandate as essential in defining national parks. Even if Finnish national parks had also been created as sights for the public, tourism development in the parks was so modest that one could hardly anticipate problems (at least of the American scale).

It seems likely that this contrast between use and preservation was something that was "learned" from the U.S. and became the center of the national park idea, even if in Finland there really had not been such a polarization between the two purposes of national parks. Articulating an American-style definition of national parks made sense—there was a lot of information available on American parks due to all the park co-operation programs—and connecting Finnish parks to American ones could

[492] Leo J. Salo, "Wilderness-alueet Yhdysvaltain kansallispuistoissa," *Silva Fennica* 8, 4 (1974): 278–283. Quote from p. 282: "Eurooppalaisen näkökulmasta katsottuna voi tuntua siltä, että amerikkalainen wilderness-liike on hieman yliampuva. On kuitenkin syytä muistaa, että Euroopan koskematon luonto hävitettiin hitaasti paljon pidemmän ajan kuluessa. Se hävisi melkeinpä huomaamatta. Pohjois-Amerikassa kaikki tämä tapahtui 200 vuodessa. Jos tuhoaminen edistyikin aikanaan ripeätä vauhtia on nykyinen vastavaikutus – 'säilyttäkää se vähä mitä on jäljellä' – yhtälailla voimakas. Ehkäpä me suomalaiset, jotka väitämme omistavamme 'Euroopan viimeiset erämaat' voisimme ottaa tästä hieman oppia."

serve as proof of the inherent value of national parks and thus aid in establishing and managing them in Finland. National parks and the international connections in park-related matters also helped Finland become a member of a group of modern, civilized nations, as having national parks was argued to be a sign of that. Experiences from the United States definitely influenced parks in Finland, so that the dual mandate of preservation and use was articulated as a key to the park idea in Finland. During the Cold War years, the Finnish park idea shifted from European-style conservation, backed by heavy scientific and aesthetic reasoning, to American-style national parks that stressed the preservation of nature but also put a heavy focus on the human use of parks.

**

In summary, the chapter has demonstrated how Yellowstone was little by little inserted into a national story, ultimately connecting the national parks of Finland with the idea that was supposedly born at the Madison Junction campfire of 1870, replacing an older narrative of a national origin. While it is clear that Finnish conservationists were active in seeking this connection with American national park ideals and used American ideas to the benefit of Finnish parks—reinventing the "national park" as an American idea in Finland was not imposed solely by Americans or US park programs—the Americanization of the Finnish national park idea and ideals also clearly showed the extent of American leadership in national park matters and international conservation co-operation.

The national park idea was not born fully formed around the Madison Junction campfire, and national parks in other countries were not necessarily influenced by Yellowstone at their inception, but could be connected to it later—like the Finnish example has demonstrated.

Epilogue: Rethinking the National Park as America's Best Idea

As this dissertation has shown, the national park idea was constructed as a positive American invention and heavily promoted as such—especially by the time of the centennial of Yellowstone National Park in 1972—with many people adopting the notion of the national park as an American idea. However, it can be noted that around this time attention in world park matters began to shift towards other regions and environmental issues. While the first two World Conferences on National Parks had been organized in the United States in 1962 and 1972, the 1982 World Conference took place in Bali, Indonesia. This trend continued, with subsequent conferences organized in Caracas, Venezuela (1992), Durban, South Africa (2003), and Sydney, Australia (2014). It seems that national parks were becoming a more global matter, for which it was harder to claim intellectual ownership. The environmental concerns of the environmental movement were about the environment more broadly—not just nature conservation—and issues such as pollution and pesticides gained attention. The de-escalation of the Cold War from the late 1980s also lessened the need for cultural diplomacy and propaganda.

By no means can the national park idea be comfortably called America's *best* idea since national parks and American conservation ideals have also been disruptive in many ways. Firstly, there is the question of land use when establishing national parks in areas of Native American settlement and the removal of those inhabitants—therefore, we need to be more critical of the national park idea as a solely positive idea. Creating the early American national parks has meant displacing Native Americans living on park lands and it has also affected other local inhabitants and their ways of living with nature.[493] Around the world, millions of indigenous inhabitants have been forcibly removed from lands they have lived on sustainably for generations to make way for conservation areas. Often this process has involved different cultural

[493] Mark David Spence, *Dispossessing the Wilderness: Indian Removal and the Making of the National Parks* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999); Karl Jacoby, *Crimes Against Nature: Squatters, Poachers, Thieves, and the Hidden History of American Conservation* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2001).

ideals related to nature and has been influenced by Western scientists and BINGOs—big international non-governmental organizations—such as the WWF.[494]

Secondly, there is the question of how well do American wilderness ideals fit other parts of the globe. Michael Lewis has provided a great discussion on whether conservation biology is based on Western cultural ideals. His research has illustrated the realities of transferring conservation and science practices based on American cultural ideals to another country—and how these ideals do not always work in other locales and are shaped into local variations.[495] Others have been more directly critical. For example, Ramachandra Guha has noted the ways in which conservation is based on American cultural ideals such as wilderness, and he has criticized the direct transfer of American ideas such as national parks to Third World countries with very different social and environmental conditions while neglecting the more pressing environmental concerns of those areas.[496] The spread of national parks and other conservation ideals is a multifaceted story, after all.

In his classic article from 1992, William Cronon discusses how the narrative form of environmental histories influences our understanding of environmental change. Cronon writes of "the narrative power to reframe the past so as to include certain events and people, exclude others, and redefine the meaning of landscape accordingly."[497] This is often true in national park narratives—for example, writing about untouched, empty nature glosses over the long settlement of Native peoples on park lands.

The spread of the national park idea and other American wilderness ideals is often presented as a progressive story. Cronon illustrates the problems of writing stories of the transformation of nature with an example from the Great Plains in the 1930s:

---

[494] Mark Dowie, *Conservation Refugees: The Hundred-Year Conflict between Global Conservation and Native Peoples* (Cambridge, MI: The MIT Press, 2011).
[495] Michael L. Lewis, *Inventing Global Ecology: Tracking the Biodiversity Ideal in India, 1947–1997* (Athens: Ohio University Press, 2004).
[496] Ramachandra Guha, "Radical American Environmentalism and Wilderness Preservation: A Third World Critique," *Environmental Ethics* 11, 1 (Spring 1989):71–83.
[497] William Cronon, "A Place for Stories: Nature, History, and Narrative," *Journal of American History* 78, 4 (March 1992), 1364.

> On the one hand, we can narrate Plains history as a story of improvement, in which the plot line gradually ascends toward an ending that is somehow more positive—happier, richer, freer, better—than the beginning. On the other hand, we can tell stories in which the plot line eventually falls toward an ending that is more negative—sadder, poorer, less free, worse—than the place where the story began.[498]

In much the same way, the spread of the national park idea can be told either as a story of the advance of nature conservation or as a story of the export of American ideals with tragic effects on native populations and their homelands. We need to carefully consider what kinds of stories we are conveying when talking about the national park idea and the establishment of national parks worldwide. Is it a story of the triumph of conservation? A story of the advance of American Cold War propaganda? Or perhaps a story of the displacement of Native inhabitants?

Yet, the idea that national parks around the globe originated from the Madison Junction campfire persists. Even today, the U.S. National Park Service clings to the narrative of national parks as America's best idea on its website. One of the links in the agency's "About Us" page is titled "The National Parks: America's Best Idea."[499] This page gives information "about the best idea" under the heading "America's Best Idea Today."[500] Clearly, then, the National Park Service continues to embrace the perceived Americanness and the positive qualities of the national park idea.

Despite its many problematic sides, the narrative of national parks as a great American idea seems to endure. In this study, I have argued that this narrative was constructed and reinforced in international national park co-operation. I have suggested that the national park idea seems to have been a part of American agenda abroad and the Cold War focus on international development and modernization, perhaps as a kind of cultural export.

In the first chapter, I examined the early American national park history and park promotion and provided an outline of national park creation in select other

[498] Cronon, "A Place for Stories," 1352.
[499] National Park Service official website, "About Us." https://www.nps.gov/aboutus/index.htm (Accessed 7 August 2019).
[500] National Park Service official website, "America's Best Idea Today." https://www.nps.gov/americasbestidea/ (Accessed 7 August 2019).

countries. I also examined the international connections of the U.S. National Park Service in the early decades of the 20th century. I proposed that in the beginning, the national park idea was not necessarily viewed as an American invention globally, but that national park beginnings in other countries had many different influences. I also argued that the national park idea was not born fully formed at Yellowstone; rather, the national park idea developed over time and began to be articulated as an American contribution only later. The national park idea in foreign countries often derived from other sources, but many countries slowly began to look to the U.S. for inspiration, and the United States was interested in influencing park development in other countries.

In the second chapter, I argued that during the Cold War, the national park idea was connected to the Cold War cultural diplomacy and modernization agenda. I also suggested that promoting the national park idea as an American idea during the Cold War strengthened its Americanness. The national park idea was promoted as a positive American innovation worldwide. I presented examples from the National Park Service's co-operation with Japan, the organizing of international national park conferences and programs, and the role of funding organizations. I also examined the important case of the African student program and showed how this program served to construct a positive image of the United States abroad through the idea of national parks.

In the third chapter, I focused on the narrative of the national park as an American invention and Yellowstone National Park as the birthplace of all national parks. First, I tracked the American relationship to wilderness and national parks. I then moved on to examine the preparations for the centennial of Yellowstone and argued that such preparations powerfully demonstrated that the campfire narrative was an important—skillfully constructed and maintained—story. Finally, I focused on Canadian national parks and their international co-operation efforts to show the uniqueness of the American promotion of the national park idea as an American idea. In the chapter, I argued that the park idea as an American idea, with its beginnings at Yellowstone, was a carefully crafted and skillfully utilized story.

In the fourth chapter, I showed that the national park idea in Finland had a national origin story of its own and was influenced by German conservation thought in the beginning, only later becoming connected to the Yellowstone story. The chapter

presented a case study that clearly showed the intellectual impact and international influence of American park programs by examining the transformation of the national park idea in Finland. I followed the Finnish national park idea from its creation to the 1980s and argued that the national park idea in Finland became reinvented as an American idea, following Finnish participation in international national park conferences and American park programs during the Cold War years.

Through these examples I have argued that the national park idea was constructed as an American idea globally—even if it was not necessarily the model for all foreign national parks earlier. I have made several new contributions to the scholarly debate on national parks as "America's best idea." I have suggested that the question of whether or not Yellowstone National Park actually was the beginning of all national parks and the extent to which the United States influenced foreign countries with the establishment of Yellowstone is ultimately not central to the narrative. My study has shown how the national park idea was constructed as an American invention much later—so powerfully that it became known as "America's best idea." In making my major argument, I have also explored many previously neglected topics, ranging from Finnish national park history, to the African student program, to efforts at retaining the Madison Junction campfire story—and linked these topics to the history of promoting the national park idea as "America's best idea." All in all, I have shown that taking into account the international dimension is central to national park history, as national parks have always been part of the transnational flow of ideas. However, further research on national parks in international perspective is needed. Putting the national park ideas of different countries into international context is essential for understanding them better and revealing their special qualities.

Throughout this dissertation I have traced how the narrative of the national park idea as an American invention was constructed, and while the view of national parks as "America's best idea" persists, we need to the rethink the accuracy of this term.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Archival collections

United States:

National Archives and Records Administration, College Park, MD (NARA)

Record Group 79, Records of the National Park Service

Record Group 43, Records of International Conferences, Commissions, and Expositions

Record Group 59, Records of the Department of State

Rockefeller Archive Center, Sleepy Hollow, NY (RAC)

Rockefeller Brothers Fund records (FA005)

Ford Foundation records, Grants H-K (FA732D)

Canada:

Library and Archives Canada, Ottawa, ON (LAC)

Record Group 84, Records of the Canadian Parks Service

Finland:

Kansallisarkisto (National Archives), Helsinki (KA)

Metsäntutkimuslaitoksen arkisto (Records of the Finnish Forest Research Institute)

Suomen Luonnonsuojeluliiton arkisto (Records of the Finnish Association for Nature Conservation)

Ympäristöministeriö (Ministry of the Environment), Helsinki (YM)

Valtion luonnonsuojeluvalvojan arkisto (Records of the Government Counselor for the Conservation of Nature)

Parliamentary debates

Valtiopäivät 1927, Pöytäkirjat I, Istunnot 1-27, Valtiopäivien alusta marraskuun 25. päivään. Helsinki 1928: Valtioneuvoston kirjapaino.

Valtiopäivät 1928, Pöytäkirjat II, Istunnot 41-68, marraskuun 21. päivästä valtiopäivien loppuun. Helsinki 1929: Valtioneuvoston kirjapaino.

Toiset Valtiopäivät 1929, Pöytäkirjat I, Istunnot 1-35, valtiopäivien alusta marraskuun 27. päivään. Helsinki 1930: Valtioneuvoston kirjapaino.

Valtiopäivät 1937, Pöytäkirjat II, Istunnot 42-81, syyskuun 1. päivästä valtiopäivien loppuun. Helsinki 1937: Valtioneuvoston kirjapaino.

Valtiopäivät 1937, Liitteet I-XII. Helsinki 1937: Valtioneuvoston kirjapaino. P. 121, Lak. al. no. 17, Cajander ym.: Ehdotus laiksi eräiden luonnonsuojelualueiden perustamisesta valtionmaille.

Printed primary sources

"Advisory Board on Wildlife Management Appointed by Secretary of the Interior Udall, A. S. Leopold (Chairman), S. A. Cain, C. M. Cottam, I. N. Gabrielson, T. L. Kimball, March 4, 1963, Wildlife Management in the National Parks." In *America's National Park System: The Critical Documents*, edited by Lary M. Dilsaver, 237–252. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1994.

"An Act for the Preservation of American Antiquities," Approved June 8, 1906 (34 Stat. 225). In Dilsaver, *America's National Park System*, 40–41.

"An Act to Establish a National Park Service, and for Other Purposes," Approved August 25, 1916 (39 Stat. 535). In Dilsaver, *America's National Park System*, 46–47.

"An Act to Establish a National Wilderness Preservation System for the Permanent Good of the Whole People, and for Other Purposes," 1964 (78 Stat. 890). In Dilsaver, *America's National Park System*, 277–286.

"An Act to Set Apart a Certain Tract of Land Lying Near the Headwaters of the Yellowstone River as a Public Park," Approved March 1, 1872 (17 Stat. 32). In Dilsaver, *America's National Park System*, 28–29.

Blåfield, Martti. "A. E. Nordenskiöld ja kansallispuistoaate." *Suomen Luonto* 5 (1980): 219–222.

Borg, Pekka, and Hannu Ormio. *Perustiedot kansallispuistoista: ihanteet ja käytäntö*. Porvoo: WSOY, 1978.

Cajander, A. K. *Metsätieteellinen tutkimustoiminta ulkomailla ja ehdotus sen järjestämiseksi Suomessa*. Helsinki: 1909 (liite Metsähallituksen vuosikertomukseen v. 1907).

Dilsaver, Lary (ed.). *America's National Park System: The Critical Documents.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1994.

Haapanen, Antti. "Alkuperäisen luonnon suojelu." *Suomen Luonto* 1 (1965): 8–16.

Haapanen, Antti. "Luonnonsuojeluvaikutelmia Yhdysvalloista." *Suomen Luonto* 3 (1966): 75–77.

Hallituksen esitys n:o 96 (1937 vp) eräiden luonnonsuojelualueiden perustamisesta valtionmaille.

Kalliola, Reino. "Alkusanat." *Suomen Luonto*: Suomen luonnonsuojelun vuosikirja (1953): 5–8.

Kalliola, Reino. “Erilaiset luonnonsuojelualueet.” *Suomen Luonto* 4 (1972): 116–120.

Kalliola, Reino. “Koko kansan hyödyksi ja iloksi: USA:n kansallispuistoista.” *Suomen Luonto* 2 (1963): 111–119.

Kalliola, Reino. “Matkailu ja retkeily luonnonsuojelun näkökulmasta.” *Suomen Luonto*: Suomen luonnonsuojelun vuosikirja (1954): 9–22.

Kalliola, Reino. “Vanhojen metsien asema ja merkitys: Kansallispuistojen metsät.” *Suomen Luonto* 2 (1973): 76–77.

Kansallispuistokomitea. *Kansallispuistokomitean mietintö*. 1976.

Linkola, Kaarlo. “Luonnonsuojelumme kehityksestä.” *Suomen Luonto:* Suomen luonnonsuojelun vuosikirja (1941).

Linkola, Kaarlo. “Suunnitelma luonnonsuojelualueiden erottamiseksi Pohjois-Suomen valtionmailla.” *Silva Fennica* 1 (1926): 1–76.

Luonnon- ja kansallispuistokomitea. *Uusien luonnon- ja kansallispuistojen perustaminen valtion maille: luonnon- ja kansallispuistokomitean mietintö*. Komiteanmietintö, 1953, 9. Helsinki: Suomen metsätieteellinen seura, 1953.

Luonnonsuojelulaki, 71/1923, 1 §.

Mikola, Peitsa. “Yhdysvaltain luonnonsuojelualueista ja niiden hallinnosta.” *Suomen Luonto*: Suomen luonnonsuojelun vuosikirja (1952): 33–45.

Muir, John. *Our National Parks*. Boston, 1901.

Nash, Roderick. “The American Invention of National Parks.” *American Quarterly* 22, 3 (Autumn 1970): 726–735.

Nash, Roderick. *Wilderness and the American Mind*. 4th ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001 [1967].

National Parks Association. *National Parks Bulletin* 32. 7 February 1923.

National Park Service. *Glimpses of Our National Parks*. Washington, D.C.: G.P.O, 1929.

National Park Service. *Glimpses of Our National Parks*. Washington, D.C.: G.P.O, 1934.

National Park Service. *Glimpses of Our National Parks*. Washington, D.C.: G.P.O, 1941.

Nordenskiöld, A. E. "Ehdotus valtionpuistojen perustamiseksi pohjoismaihin." ["Förslag till inrättandet af Riksparker i de nordiska länderna."], 1880. Quoted in Finnish in Rolf Palmgren, *Luonnonsuojelu ja kulttuuri* I-II, 51–53. Helsinki: Otava, 1922.

Ormio, Hannu. "Missä viipyy kansallispuistojen hoito." *Suomen Luonto* 4 (1972): 121–123.

Ormio, Hannu. "Paine kasvaa USA:n kansallispuistoihin." *Suomen Luonto* 5-6 (1970): 170–172.

Paavolainen, Eero-Pekka. "Yellowstone National Park 100 vuotta." *Suomen Luonto* 2 (1973): 70–74.

Palmgren, Rolf. *Luonnonsuojelu ja kulttuuri* I-II. Helsinki: Otava, 1922.

Perttula, Minttu. *Suomen kansallispuistojärjestelmän kehittyminen 1960–1990-luvuilla ja U.S. National Park Servicen vaikutukset puistojen hoitoon*. Vantaa: Metsähallitus, 2006.

Richey, Charles A. "National Parks of Japan." *National Parks Magazine* 23, 97 (April-June 1949): 16–20.

Salo, Leo J. "Wilderness-alueet Yhdysvaltain kansallispuistoissa." *Silva Fennica* 8, 4 (1974): 278–283.

"Stipendiaattina 60 vuotta sitten: Professori Peitsa Mikolalle ASLA-stipendi oli ponnahduslauta laajaan kansainväliseen toimintaan." *Fulbright Center News* 1 (2010): 12–14.

Suomen Luonto 5 (1980).

Suominen, Teuvo. "Luonnonsuojelualueittemme alennustila." *Suomen Luonto* 4 (1972): 114–115.

US Department of the Interior. *The National Park Story in Pictures*. Washington DC: US Government Printing Office, 1957.

Yard, Robert Sterling. *Glimpses of Our National Parks*. Washington: Govt. print. off., 1916.

Yard, Robert Sterling. *The Book of the National Parks*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1921.

Yard, Robert Sterling. *The National Parks Portfolio.* 2nd. ed. Washington, D.C.: Govt. print. off., 1917.

Online primary sources

National Park Service Management Policies 2006
https://www.nps.gov/policy/MP_2006.pdf. Accessed 26 July 2019.

National Park Service official website, "About Us."
https://www.nps.gov/aboutus/index.htm. Accessed 7 August 2019.

National Park Service official website, "America's Best Idea Today."
https://www.nps.gov/americasbestidea/. Accessed 7 August 2019.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Adas, Michael. *Dominance by Design: Technological Imperatives and America's Civilizing Mission*. Cambridge: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2006.

Arndt, Richard T. *The First Resort of Kings: American Cultural Diplomacy in the Twentieth Century*. Dulles, VA: Potomac Books, 2005.

Barnet, Richard J. *The Alliance—America, Europe, Japan: Makers of the Postwar World*. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1983.

Barnhisel, Greg. *Cold War Modernists: Art, Literature, and American Cultural Diplomacy, 1946–1959*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2015.

Barringer, Mark Daniel. *Selling Yellowstone: Capitalism and the Construction of Nature*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2002.

Bayly, C.A., Sven Beckert, Matthew Connelly, Isabel Hofmeyr, Wendy Kozol, and Patricia Seed. "AHR Conversation: On Transnational History." *The American Historical Review* 111, 5 (2006): 1441–1464.

Beinart, William, and Peter Coates. *Environment and History: The Taming of Nature in the USA and South Africa*. London: Routledge, 1995.

Bella, Leslie. *Parks for Profit*. Montreal: Harvest House, 1987.

Bender, Thomas (ed.). *Rethinking American History in a Global Age*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2002.

Binnema, Theodore, and Melanie Niemi. "'Let the Line Be Drawn Now': Wilderness, Conservation, and the Exclusion of Aboriginal People from Banff National Park in Canada." *Environmental History* 11, 4 (2006): 724–750.

Birmingham, David. *The Decolonization of Africa*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1995.

Brain, Stephen. "The Appeal of Appearing Green: Soviet-American Ideological Competition and Cold War Environmental Diplomacy." *Cold War History* 16, 4 (2016): 443–462.

Brown, Robert Craig. "The Doctrine of Usefulness: Natural Resource and National Park Policy in Canada, 1887–1914." In *Canadian Parks in Perspective: Based on the Conference the Canadian National Parks Today and Tomorrow, Calgary, October 1968*, edited by J. G. Nelson, 46–62. 2nd ed. Montreal: Harvest House, 1975.

Callicott, J. Baird, and Michael P. Nelson (eds.). *The Great New Wilderness Debate*. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1998.

Callicott, J. Baird, and Michael P. Nelson (eds.). *The Wilderness Debate Rages on: Continuing the Great New Wilderness Debate.* Athens: University of Georgia Press, 2008.

Campbell, Claire Elizabeth (ed.). *A Century of Parks Canada 1911–2011*. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2011.

Campbell, Claire Elizabeth. "Governing a Kingdom: Parks Canada, 1911–2011." In *A Century of Parks Canada 1911–2011*, edited by Claire Elizabeth Campbell, 1–19. Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2011.

Carruthers, Jane. *National Park Science. A Century of Research in South Africa*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2017.

Carruthers, Jane. *The Kruger National Park: A Social and Political History*. Pietermaritzburg: University of Natal Press, 1995.

Carruthers, Jane. "The Royal Natal National Park, Kwazulu-Natal: Mountaineering, Tourism and Nature Conservation in South Africa's First National Park c.1896 to c.1947." *Environment and History* 19, 4 (November 2013): 459–485.

Catton, Theodore. "A Short History of the New Zealand National Park System." In *National Parks Beyond the Nation: Global Perspectives on "America's Best Idea"*, edited by Adrian Howkins, Jared Orsi, and Mark Fiege, 68–90. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2016.

Cronin, J. Keri. *Manufacturing National Park Nature: Photography, Ecology, and the Wilderness Industry of Jasper.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2011.

Cronon, William. "A Place for Stories: Nature, History, and Narrative." *The Journal of American History* 78, 4 (March 1992): 1347–1376.

Cronon, William. C*hanges in the Land: Indians, Colonists, and the Ecology of New England*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1983.

Cronon, William. *Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West*. New York: Norton, 1991.

Cronon, William. "The Trouble with Wilderness; or, Getting Back to the Wrong Nature." In *Uncommon Ground: Toward Reinventing Nature*, edited by William Cronon, 69–90. New York: Norton, 1995.

Crosby, Alfred W. *Ecological Imperialism: The Biological Expansion of Europe, 900–1900*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Crosby, Alfred W. *The Columbian Exchange: Biological and Cultural Consequences of 1492*. Westport: Greenwood Publishing Company, 1972.

Cullather, Nick. *The Hungry World: America's Cold War Battle Against Poverty in Asia*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2010.

De Bont, Raf. "A World Laboratory: Framing the Albert National Park." *Environmental History* 22 (2017): 404–432.

De Bont, Raf, Simone Schleper, and Hans Schouwenburg. "Conservation Conferences and Expert Networks in the Short Twentieth Century." *Environment and History* 23 (2017): 569–599.

Dilsaver, Lary M. (ed.). *America's National Park System: The Critical Documents*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, 1994.

Dorsey, Kurkpatrick. *The Dawn of Conservation Diplomacy: U.S.-Canadian Wildlife Protection Treaties in the Progressive Era*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998.

Dowie, Mark. *Conservation Refugees: The Hundred-Year Conflict between Global Conservation and Native Peoples.* Cambridge, MI: The MIT Press, 2011.

Dunlap, Thomas R. “Beyond the Parks, beyond the Borders: Some of the Places to Take Tyrrell’s Perspective.” *Journal of American Studies* 46, 1 (February 2012): 31–36.

Dunlap, Thomas R. *Nature and the English Diaspora: Environment and History in the United States, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999.

Ekbladh, David. *The Great American Mission: Modernization and the Construction of an American World Order*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2010.

Environmental History 1, 1 (January 1996).

Falk, Andrew J. *Upstaging the Cold War: American Dissent and Cultural Diplomacy, 1940-1960.* Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press, 2011.

Feldman, James W. *A Storied Wilderness: Rewilding the Apostle Islands*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2011.

Fiege, Mark. *The Republic of Nature: An Environmental History of the United States.* Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2012.

Fiege, Mark, Adrian Howkins, and Jared Orsi, “Beyond the Best Idea: A Look at Mount Rainier, Antarctica, and the Sonoran Desert.” In *National Parks Beyond the Nation: Global Perspectives on “America’s Best Idea”*, edited by Adrian Howkins, Jared Orsi, and Mark Fiege, 14–48. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2016.

Fields, Marek. *Reinforcing Finland’s Attachment to the West: British and American Propaganda and Cultural Diplomacy in Finland, 1944–1962*. Doctoral Dissertation. Helsinki: University of Helsinki, 2015.

Finney, Carolyn. *Black Faces, White Spaces: Reimagining the Relationship of African Americans to the Great Outdoors*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2014.

Ford, Caroline. "Imperial Preservation and Landscape Reclamation: National Parks and Natural Reserves in French Colonial Africa." In *Civilizing Nature: National Parks in Global Historical Perspective*, edited by Bernhard Gissibl, Sabine Höhler, and Patrick Kupper, 68–83. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2012.

Foreman, Dave. "Wilderness Areas for Real." In *The Great New Wilderness Debate*, edited by J. Baird Callicott and Michael P. Nelson, 395–407. Athens: University of Georgia Press, 1998.

Foster, Janet. *Working for Wildlife: The Beginning of Preservation in Canada*. 2nd ed. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1998.

Fox, Stephen. *The American Conservation Movement: John Muir and His Legacy*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.

Frank, Jerry J. *Making Rocky Mountain National Park: The Environmental History of an American Treasure*. Lawrence, KS: University Press of Kansas, 2013.

Gissibl, Bernhard, Sabine Höhler, and Patrick Kupper (eds.). *Civilizing Nature: National Parks in Global Historical Perspective*. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2012.

Gordon, Andrew (ed.). *Postwar Japan as History*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1993.

Guha, Ramachandra. "Radical American Environmentalism and Wilderness Preservation: A Third World Critique." *Environmental Ethics* 11 (1989): 71–83.

Hanhimäki, Jussi M. *Scandinavia and the United States: An Insecure Friendship*. New York: Twayne Publishers, 1997.

Hargreaves, John D. *Decolonization in Africa*. London and New York: Longman, 1988.

Harper, Melissa, and Richard White. "How National Were the First National Parks? Comparative Perspectives from the British Settler Societies." In *Civilizing Nature: National Parks in Global Historical Perspective*, edited by Bernhard Gissibl, Sabine Höhler, and Patrick Kupper, 50–67. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2012.

Harvey, Mark W. T. *A Symbol of Wilderness: Echo Park and the American Conservation Movement*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2000.

Harvey, Mark. *Wilderness Forever: Howard Zahniser and the Path to the Wilderness Act*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2007.

Haves, Thomas R. H. *Parkscapes: Green Spaces in Modern Japan*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 2011.

Hays, Samuel P. *Conservation and the Gospel of Efficiency: The Progressive Conservation Movement, 1890–1920*. New Haven: Harvard University Press, 1959.

Heimonen, Jyrki, and Jani Kaaro (eds.). *Luonto-Liiton historia 1943–1998: Jatkosodan varjosta Jerisjärven tielle*. Helsinki: Luonto-Liitto, 1999.

Helminen, Matti. "Perämetsästä matkailukohteeksi vai päinvastoin? Kansallispuistojemme vaiheita." In *Kansallispuistojen juhlavuoden seminaari Kolilla 28.–29.10.1996*, edited by Timo Muhonen and Seija Sulonen. Metsäntutkimuslaitoksen tiedonantoja 718. Joensuu: Metsäntutkimuslaitos, 1998.

Howkins, Adrian, Jared Orsi, and Mark Fiege (eds.). *National Parks Beyond the Nation: Global Perspectives on "America's Best Idea"*. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2016.

Hunt, Michael H. *American Ascendancy: How the United States Gained and Wielded Global Dominance*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.

Jacoby, Karl. *Crimes against Nature: Squatters, Poachers, Thieves, and the Hidden History of American Conservation*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 2001.

Jones, Karen. "Unpacking Yellowstone: The American National Park in Global Perspective." In *Civilizing Nature: National Parks in Global Historical Perspective*, edited by Bernhard Gissibl, Sabine Höhler, and Patrick Kupper, 31–49. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2012.

Jones, Karen R. *Wolf Mountains: A History of Wolves Along the Great Divide.* Calgary: University of Calgary Press, 2001.

Jones, Karen R., and John Wills. *Invention of the Park: Recreational Landscapes from the Garden of Eden to Disney's Magic Kingdom*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2005.

Jørgensen, Finn Arne et al. "Entangled Environments: Historians and Nature in the Nordic Countries." *Historisk Tidsskrift* (Norway) 92, 1 (2013).

Kopas, Paul. *Taking the Air: Ideas and Change in Canada's National Parks*. Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2007.

Kupper, Patrick. "Nature's Laboratories? Exploring the Intersection of Science and National Parks." In *National Parks Beyond the Nation: Global Perspectives on "America's Best Idea"*, edited by Adrian Howkins, Jared Orsi, and Mark Fiege, 114–132. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2016.

Kupper, Patrick. “Translating Yellowstone: Early European National Parks, Weltnaturschutz, and the Swiss Model.” In *Civilizing Nature: National Parks in Global Historical Perspective*, edited by Bernhard Gissibl, Sabine Höhler, and Patrick Kupper, 123–139. New York and Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2012.

Kupper, Patrick. “Science and the National Parks: A Transatlantic Perspective on the Interwar Years.” *Environmental History* 14, 1 (January 2009): 58–81.

Kupper, Patrick. *Wildnis schaffen: Eine transnationale Geschichte des Schweizerischen Nationalparks*. Bern: Haupt, 2012.

Latham, Michael E. *Modernization as Ideology: American Social Science and “Nation Building” in the Kennedy Era*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 2007.

Latham, Michael E. *The Right Kind of Revolution: Modernization, Development, and U.S. Foreign Policy from the Cold War to the Present*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2011.

Le Sueur, James D. (ed.). *The Decolonization Reader*. New York and London: Routledge, 2003.

Leino-Kaukiainen, Pirkko. “Fontainebleausta Rioon: Luonnonsuojeluaate ja metsäluonto.” In *Luonnon ehdoilla vai ihmisen arvoilla?: Polemiikkia metsiensuojelusta 1850–1990*, edited by Heikki Roiko-Jokela, 167–222. Jyväskylä: Atena, 1997.

Lewis, Michael (ed.). *American Wilderness: A New History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Lewis, Michael L. *Inventing Global Ecology: Tracking the Biodiversity Ideal in India, 1947-1997*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2004.

Loo, Tina. *States of Nature: Conserving Canada's Wildlife in the Twentieth Century.* Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 2006.

Lothian, W.F. *A Brief History of Canada's National Parks*. Ottawa: Environment Canada, 1987.

Louter, David. *Windshield Wilderness: Cars, Roads and Nature in Washington's National Parks*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2006.

MacEachern, Alan. "Canada's Best Idea? The Canadian and American National Park Services in the 1910s." In *National Parks Beyond the Nation: Global Perspectives on "America's Best Idea"*, edited by Adrian Howkins, Jared Orsi, and Mark Fiege, 51–67. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2016.

MacEachern, Alan. *Natural Selections: National Parks in Atlantic Canada, 1935–1970*. Montreal & Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2001.

Mauch, Christof. "Which World Is with Us? A Tocquevillian View on American Environmental History." *Journal of American History* 100, 1 (2013): 124–127.

Mels, Tom. *Wild Landscapes: The Cultural Nature of Swedish National Parks*. Lund: Lund University Press, 1999.

Mikkeli, Heikki. "Crossing Borders: Transnational European History and Cosmopolitan Ideals." Unpublished manuscript.

Mikkeli, Heikki. "Metsäturkki ja sen jurot parturit: Näkemyksiä metsäluonnon ja kansanluonteen suhteesta 1800–1900-luvulla." *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* 90, 3 (1992): 200–215.

Myllyntaus, Timo. "Environment in Explaining History: Restoring Humans as Part of Nature." In *Encountering the Past in Nature: Essays in Environmental History*, edited

by Timo Myllyntaus and Mikko Saikku, 141–160. 2nd, rev. ed. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2001.

Myllyntaus, Timo. “Suomalaisen ympäristöhistorian kehityslinjoja.” *Historiallinen Aikakauskirja* 89, 4 (1991): 321–331.

Myllyntaus, Timo, and Mikko Saikku. “Environmental History: A New Discipline with Long Traditions.” In *Encountering the Past in Nature: Essays in Environmental History*, edited by Timo Myllyntaus and Mikko Saikku, 1–28. 2nd, rev. ed. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2001.

Nash, Roderick. “The American Invention of National Parks.” *American Quarterly* 22, 3 (Autumn 1970): 726–735.

Nash, Roderick. *Wilderness and the American Mind*. 4th ed. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2001 [1967].

Niemi, Seija A. *A Pioneer of Nordic Conservation: The Environmental Literacy of A. E. Nordenskiöld (1832–1901)*. Doctoral Dissertation. Turku: University of Turku, 2018.

Niemi, Seija A. “The Historical Roots of A. E. Nordenskiöld’s (1832–1901) Conservational Philosophy.” *Scandinavian Journal of History* 43, 5 (December 2018): 581-600.

Osgood, Kenneth. *Total Cold War: Eisenhower’s Secret Propaganda Battle at Home and Abroad*. Lawrence: University of Kansas Press, 2006.

Parmar, Inderjeet. *Foundations of the American Century: The Ford, Carnegie, and Rockefeller Foundations in the Rise of American Power*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2012.

Parpola, Antti, and Veijo Åberg. *Metsävaltio: Metsähallitus ja Suomi 1859–2009.* Helsinki: Edita, 2009.

Pekurinen, Mika. "Sivistys velvoittaa: Klassinen luonnonsuojelu Suomessa." In *Luonnon ehdoilla vai ihmisen arvoilla?: Polemiikkia metsiensuojelusta 1850–1990*, edited by Heikki Roiko-Jokela, 129–166. Jyväskylä: Atena, 1997.

Perttula, Minttu. *Suomen kansallispuistojärjestelmän kehittyminen 1960–1990-luvuilla ja U.S. National Park Servicen vaikutukset puistojen hoitoon*. Vantaa: Metsähallitus, 2006.

Pritchard, James A. *Preserving Yellowstone's Natural Conditions: Science and the Perception of Nature*. Lincoln & London: University of Nebraska Press, 1999.

Roiko-Jokela, Heikki (ed.). *Luonnon ehdoilla vai ihmisen arvoilla?: Polemiikkia metsiensuojelusta 1850–1990.* Jyväskylä: Atena, 1997.

Rothman, Hal. *America's National Monuments: The Politics of Preservation*. University Press of Kansas, 1989.

Runte, Alfred. *National Parks: The American Experience*. 2nd, rev. ed. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1987 [1979].

Räsänen, Tuomas. "Converging Environmental Knowledge: Re-Evaluating the Birth of Modern Environmentalism in Finland." *Environment and History* 18, 2 (2012): 159–181.

Saari, Paula Johanna. "Marketing Nature: The Canadian National Parks Branch and Constructing the Portrayal of National Parks in Promotional Brochures, 1936–1970." *Environment and History* 21, 3 (2015): 401–446.

Saari, Paula. “Selling the Scenery or Preserving the Wilderness: Canadian Members of Parliament and their Views on the Purpose of National Parks, 1945–64.” *International Journal of Canadian Studies* 49 (2014): 253–284.

Sandlos, John. “Federal Spaces, Local Conflicts: National Parks and the Exclusionary Politics of the Conservation Movement in Ontario, 1900–1935.” *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association* 16, 1 (2005): 293–318.

Sandlos, John. “Not Wanted in the Boundary: The Expulsion of the Keeseekoowenin Ojibway Band from Riding Mountain National Park.” *Canadian Historical Review* 89, 2 (June 2008): 189–221.

Schullery, Paul, and Lee H. Whittlesey. *Myth and History in the Creation of Yellowstone National Park*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2003.

Schwartz, Katrina Z. S. *Nature and National Identity after Communism: Globalizing the Ethnoscape.* Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2006.

Seigel, Micol. “Beyond Compare: Comparative Method after the Transnational Turn.” *Radical History Review* 91 (2005): 62–90.

Sellars, Richard West. *Preserving Nature in the National Parks: A History*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press, 1997.

Shaffer, Marguerite S. *See America First*: *Tourism and National Identity 1880–1940.* Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 2001.

Spence, Mark David. *Dispossessing the Wilderness: Indian Removal and the Making of the National Parks*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.

Stephan, Alexander. “Cold War Alliances and the Emergence of Transatlantic Competition: An Introduction.” In *The Americanization of Europe: Culture, Diplomacy,*

and Anti-Americanism after 1945, edited by Alexander Stephan, 1–20. New York & Oxford: Berghahn Books, 2006.

Sutter, Paul S. *Driven Wild: How the Fight against Automobiles Launched the Modern Wilderness Movement*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2002.

Sutter, Paul S. "Geographies of Hope: Lessons from a World of National Parks." In *National Parks Beyond the Nation: Global Perspectives on "America's Best Idea"*, edited by Adrian Howkins, Jared Orsi, and Mark Fiege, 278–296. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 2016.

Sutter, Paul S. "The Trouble with 'America's National Parks'; or, Going Back to the Wrong Historiography: A Response to Ian Tyrrell." *Journal of American Studies* 46, 1 (2012): 23–29.

Sutter, Paul S. "The World with Us: The State of American Environmental History." *Journal of American History* 100, 1 (2013): 94–119.

Sutter, Paul. "What Can U.S. Environmental Historians Learn from Non-U.S. Environmental Historiography?" *Environmental History* 8, 1 (January 2003): 109–129.

Swenson, Astrid. "Response to Ian Tyrrell, 'America's National Parks: The Transnational Creation of National Space in the Progressive Era.'" *Journal of American Studies* 46, 1 (February 2012): 37–43.

Taylor, Joseph E., III. "Boundary Terminology." *Environmental History* 13, 3 (July 2008): 454–481.

Telkänranta, Helena. *Laulujoutsenen perintö: Suomalaisen ympäristöliikkeen taival.* Helsinki: WSOY, 2008.

Turner, James Morton. *The Promise of Wilderness: American Environmental Politics since 1964*. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2012.

Tyrrell, Ian. "America's National Parks: The Transnational Creation of National Space in the Progressive Era." *Journal of American Studies* 46, 1 (February 2012): 1–21.

Tyrrell, Ian. *True Gardens of the Gods: Californian-Australian Environmental Reform, 1860–1930*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1999.

Wakild, Emily. "Border Chasm: International Boundary Parks and Mexican Conservation 1935–1945." *Environmental History* 14, 3 (July 2009): 453–475.

Wakild, Emily. *Revolutionary Parks: Conservation, Social Justice, and Mexico's National Parks, 1910–1940.* Tucson: University of Arizona Press, 2011.

Warren, Louis S. *The Hunter's Game: Poachers and Conservationists in Twentieth Century America*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.

White, Richard. "From Wilderness to Hybrid Landscapes: The Cultural Turn in Environmental History." *The Historian* 66 (Fall 2004): 557–564.

White, Richard. *The Organic Machine: The Remaking of the Columbia River*. New York: Hill and Wang, 1995.

Worster, Donald. *A Passion for Nature: The Life of John Muir*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.

Worster, Donald. "Appendix: Doing Environmental History." In *The Ends of the Earth*, edited by Donald Worster, 289–307. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Worster, Donald. *Dust Bowl: The Southern Plains in the 1930s*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1979.

Worster, Donald. *Rivers of Empire: Water, Aridity, and the Growth of the American West*. New York: Pantheon Books, 1985.

Worster, Donald. "Wild, Tame, and Free: Comparing Canadian and U.S. Views of Nature." In *Parallel Destinies: Canadian-American Relations West of the Rockies*, edited by John M. Findlay and Ken S. Coates, 246–273. Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2002.

Young, Terence, and Lary M. Dilsaver. "Collecting and Diffusing 'the World's Best Thought': International Cooperation by the National Park Service." *The George Wright Forum* 28, 3 (2011): 269–278.

Young, Terence, Alan MacEachern, and Lary Dilsaver. "Canada-US Cooperation: From Continental Competitors to Global Partners." Forthcoming in *Environment and History*.

Youngs, Yolonda. "Editing Nature in Grand Canyon National Park Postcards." *Geographical Review* 102, 4 (2012): 486–509.

Zunz, Olivier. *Philanthropy in America: A History*. Princeton and Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2012.